

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1958

Rev. Edwin S. Hunt, minister, Covenant Methodist Church, Evanston, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou who art ever first to the meeting place when we attune the sanctuary of our innermost being with that which is unchanging and absolute, good, true, lovely, pure, and of good report, reveal Thyself to us in this hour as the God who watches over all of our ways and gives us the directions for our pilgrimage of life.

As we pause in these sacred moments, our prayer is that all may feel the high challenge of these times of exciting change. Grant us the strength of spirit to accept the plateau of tension of our age with the enthusiasm of our individualistic forefathers; chide us when our sight of Thee and Thy goals for us is blighted by a township mind of parochial partisanships and patronage; bless us when our spirits overflow with the God-conceived concepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for the bodies, minds, and souls of humankind everywhere.

Bring close Thy soul to the soul of our President, the assembled bodies of our Nation's leaders, and all our people. Make all of us aware of our responsibility to and our dependence upon each other, but, most of all, of our one great dependence upon Thee, for it is in Thy name that we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 31, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3051) to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HALEY, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DAWSON of Utah, and Mr. WESTLAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8826) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1956, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12140) to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other reasons.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 985) to provide that chief judges of circuit courts and chief judges of district courts having three or more judges shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit in executive session during the session of the Senate today. I understand the committee is considering the school scholarship bill. We are very hopeful the bill can be reported, and we can get action on it before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object to that also.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following the eulogies of the late Senator Neely and the late Senator Scott, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 2029, House bill 8381, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to make certain corrections and technical amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the Secretary will state the nomination on the calendar.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the President saw fit to renominate Mr. Hutchinson. He is a very able lawyer, and is highly regarded throughout our State of Texas. He has a judicial temperament. He is a very conscientious and dedicated public servant; and, I repeat, I am pleased, as is my junior colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH], to have the opportunity to vote to confirm this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate endorse and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of this confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 10277. An act to reduce from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of paper in rolls which may be imported into the United States free of duty as standard newsprint paper (Rept. No. 2092).

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2091)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 4162) to further amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 4215. A bill to preserve Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church national historic site by authorizing the acquisition of abutting properties, and for other purposes; and

S. 4216. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), as amended, providing for the establishment of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 4217. A bill for the relief of Ursula Gewinner; and

S. 4218. A bill for the relief of Yasuko Kitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 4219. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 4220. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 4221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita McDowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 4222. A bill for the relief of John A. Skenandore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 4223. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 4224. A bill to require the filing of evidentiary briefs by the United States in connection with the entry of consent decrees, judgments, and orders in civil antitrust actions; and

S. 4225. A bill to authorize the recovery of actual costs reasonably incurred by plaintiffs in private actions for injunctive relief from antitrust violations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 4226. A bill to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Table Rock Reservoir for the purpose of water supply for a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Public Works.

ANNUAL REPORTS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CONCERNING STRENGTH AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution for appropriate reference, which reads as follows:

Whereas the cost of defense is yearly mounting to unprecedented totals, constituting by far the major portion of the national budget and requiring raising the Federal debt limit to a size increasingly burdensome to our citizens and dangerous to our economy; and

Whereas the perfectly natural anxieties of our military leaders and the constantly increasing complexity and cost of our weapons systems are forever multiplying military expenditures, theoretically limited only by the ultimate conditions of the garrison state; and

Whereas the Congress shares with the administrative branch of the Government responsibility for the national defense; and

Whereas the situation critically demands a legislative review of the overall program of national defense to carry out these responsibilities properly; and

Whereas such a program is not now presented to the appropriate committees of the Congress, namely the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, but only to the Appropriations Committees of those Houses as line-by-line appropriation requests, in such form and at such a time as to make impossible the determination of an overall defense policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that in order to establish procedures for better informing the Armed Services Committees of the Congress concerning the strength and organization of the Department of Defense that the Secretary of Defense should present to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report explaining the strength and organization planned by the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year.

This report should include but should not be limited to presentations explaining personnel strengths for the active and reserve components of the military services, materiel procurement, maintenance plans, research and development activities and the authorizations for military construction.

The above report should be presented within 30 days of the opening date of each session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 110) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROMOTION OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN INTEGRITY OF CONGRESS AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to improve the public service. This bill is the result of much concern and several years of thought on how best to maintain high standards in both Congress and in the executive branch of Government.

The bill has four major provisions:

First. The requirement that Members of Congress and all employees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government earning in excess of \$12,500 a year and candidates for Federal office file an annual report of income, including reimbursement for any expenditure, gifts in excess of \$100 in amount or value, fees or honorariums for speeches or articles, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by an individual in kind; all dealings in securities, commodities, or real property during the year. These reports would be filed with the Comptroller General and would be open to the press and the public.

Second. The requirement that all communications, whether written or

oral, including those from Congress and the executive branch, with respect to any case pending before a Federal agency be made a part of the public record of such case.

Third. A requirement that committees of the Senate and the House file annually itemized expense accounts for all travel, subsistence, or accommodations used by members of such committees or staff members. The reports shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Fourth. The establishment of a Commission on Legislative Standards to conduct a study of problems of conflicts of interest and of relations with executive agencies which confront Members of Congress, with a view to devising and recommending measures and procedures to deal with such problems. This would include such problems as that of disqualification of particular votes, and the often difficult determination of the line between adequate representation of constituent interest and attempted influence.

The key section of this bill is the first one. The requirement for disclosure of gifts and fees received by Members of Congress or Federal employees will serve as a brake on both those who would influence and those who would be influenced. When an individual realizes a gift will be a matter of public record, he is likely to give additional consideration to the propriety of the gift. The principle involved is similar to that employed in the Federal Lobbying Act and the proposed Federal Elections Act.

The mere existence of such a report will make it easier for the legislator and the policymaker to reject such gifts.

This bill would apply to all persons in the upper grades who are likely to be in a position to make or influence policy in the executive branch. It would also apply to persons at equivalent levels in the services and in the legislative branch. In fairness to incumbent Members of Congress, it would also include candidates for Congress. It is possible that the scope of this bill is too large. I feel it is better to err on the side of inclusion, rather than permit any important class of officials to be exempted. If experience indicates the need for amendments, they can be made.

Respect for privacy is deeply ingrained in Americans. I value it highly myself. But, reluctantly, I have concluded that in this instance an overriding public interest makes necessary the disclosure of information for which my bill would provide. Action is necessary, and I am convinced that it would be far more effective to turn the spotlight of publicity on all gifts and favors than to attempt to draw a line between those which are proper and improper. My bill would require public officials to exercise their own judgment in acceptance of favors and then would give the public the chance to decide whether the judgment exercised was sound.

I realize that legislative proposals such as this one and similar proposals and proposals having similar objectives

by Senators DOUGLAS, NEUBERGER, IVES, JAVITS, CLARK, and others, are not rushed to early enactment. Yet their introduction does serve a useful purpose. Inevitably they focus attention upon the difficult problems which exist in this area and help to arouse public interest with eventual beneficial effects.

The bill itself is, of course, far from perfect. It will not plug all the gaps. But it could be a start. Disclosure can help to dispel the cynical view of politics and public service that has made "politician" almost a dirty word among far too many people. You and I know that most public servants do not take graft and do not respond to improper pressure. Rather, most of them are trying conscientiously to serve the public interest as best they can whether they be in the executive or the legislative branch.

Through legislation such as this we can help to correct the distorted image of public officials that now exists in many quarters and thereby encourage the ablest and best in our communities to continue to seek public office in both appointive and elective capacities.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the bill in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4223) to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner), each civil or military officer and each employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$12,500 per annum shall file annually, and each individual who is a candidate of a political party in a general election for the office of Senator or Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives but who, at the time he becomes a candidate does not occupy any such office, shall file within 1 month after he is so selected or so becomes, with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) The amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by him or by him and his spouse jointly during the preceding calendar year which exceeds \$100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by any individual for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by any individual in kind;

(2) The value of each asset held by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, and the

amount of each liability owed by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of the close of the preceding calendar year;

(3) All dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year;

(4) All purchases and sales of real property or any interest therein by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year.

(b) Except as hereinbefore provided, reports required by this section (other than reports so required by candidates of political parties) shall be filed not later than April 30 of each year. In the case of any person who ceases, prior to such date in any year, to occupy the office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon him the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report on the last day he occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than 3 months after such last day, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities, and purchases and sales of real property, where separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure of the income, net worth, dealings in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

(d) Each report required by this section shall be made under penalty for perjury. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this section, or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined \$2,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Comptroller General as public records which, under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, an individual shall be considered to have been a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, a Delegate or Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof, during any calendar year if he served in any such position for more than 6 months during such calendar year.

(g) As used in this section—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U. S. C., sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C., sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act (title 5, U. S. C., sec. 1004) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Communications to agency: All written communications and memorandums stating the circumstances, source, and substance of all oral communications made to the agency, or any officer or employee thereof, with respect to such case by any person who is not an officer or employee of the agency

shall be made a part of the public record of such case. This subsection shall not apply to communications to any officer, employee, or agent of the agency engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the agency with respect to such case."

SEC. 3. Each standing and select committee of the Senate and each joint committee the funds of which are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall report to the Secretary of the Senate, and each standing and select committee of the House of Representatives and each joint committee the funds of which are disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall report to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within 15 days after June 30 and December 31 of each year, beginning with the year 1959, the name of each member or employee of such committee or any subcommittee thereof who, during the preceding 6-month period, has engaged in official travel for such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, at public expense. Such report shall particularize each item of expense incurred by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, with respect to the travel of each such member or employee and shall include the value of any transportation, subsistence, or accommodations provided such member or employee, while on such official travel, by any department or agency of the Government, including the dollar equivalent of any amounts made available to or expended on behalf of such member or employee from foreign currencies owned by the United States. The committee or subcommittee concerned shall reimburse any department or agency of the Government for any transportation, subsistence, or accommodations provided any member or employee of such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, by such department or agency while such member or employee is engaged in official travel for such committee or subcommittee. The reports provided for by this section shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as soon after such reports are made as is practicable.

SEC. 4. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be established a Commission to be known as the "Commission on Legislative Standards" (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) which shall be composed of 4 members to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and 4 members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) The members shall be citizens of the United States (A) who are interested in good government and who by reason of professional training and experience are peculiarly qualified to carry out the duties of the Commission, and (B) who hold no elective or party office or position.

(3) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members and shall establish rules for its procedure.

(4) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) The members of the Commission shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(b) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to

reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

(d) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study of problems of conflicts of interest and of relations with executive agencies which confront Members of Congress with a view to devising and recommending measures and procedures to deal with such problems.

(e) (1) The Commission or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof may, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the Chairman of any such subcommittee (with the approval of a majority of the members thereof), and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman of the Commission or the Chairman of any such subcommittee. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(2) The Commission may authorize the Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable. When the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(3) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, independent instrumentality of the Government, or congressional committee any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this section; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

(f) The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities and the results of its studies and investigations, together with such legislative recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than January 30, 1960, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist.

(g) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to commend my friend the Senator from New Jersey for the introduction of his bill and for the excellent statement he has made in support of it, and to express the hope that his bill, together with the one the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I offered, and the bill offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will have a better fate in the 86th Congress than they are obviously going to have in the 85th Congress. I hope that when we come back next January the memory of Sherman Adams and Goldfine will continue to press us to enact this type of legislation, which was needed a long time before this particular incident caught the public imagination. I thank my friend for yielding to me and

to commend him for his activity in this field.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I have known of his deep interest in this activity. As he suggests, the problem we confront is not of one day or of recent times, or one which can be easily disposed of. It is one which requires and will always require a continuing effort. That is the purpose of the bills which I and my other colleagues who have been active in this field have introduced.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We are still in the morning hour; therefore, I shall speak only briefly on the bill introduced by the able Senator from New Jersey. I am pleased that he has presented the bill, if for no other reason than that it will bring about better information, better education, and better enlightenment in this vital field and will thus help bring about beneficial results. I hope that his bill, or perhaps the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself, or a combination of them, will be enacted. The mere presentation of such proposed legislation helps to do a great deal of good.

I wish to add just an additional thought to the very clear and concise statement made by the Senator from New Jersey. In addition to providing ethical standards for officials of Government, I believe we must accompany such efforts with some legislation which will limit, or control, the huge campaign funds which those officials need to be elected to public office. I believe the two things must go hand in hand; ethical standards to be observed by public officials, and some control over campaign expenditures, so that they may become better public officials. I believe they are the twin goals we must seek. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I particularly wish to emphasize his contributions, which have been both nonpartisan and of great aid toward understanding the problem. I wish also to commend him for his writings in magazines and other media of communication, which have been enormously helpful. I realize that the area with which my bill deals and with which bills introduced by other Senators deal relate to only one part of the problem, and that they are closely related to the area involving the matter of campaign contributions to political parties and to individuals. That is why I emphasized in my remarks earlier that I regard as a companion measure the bill to revise the Federal elections law which the Committee on Rules and Administration reported last year. I thank the Senator.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARRETT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him,

to the bill (S. 932) to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice; to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners; to provide for admission to and control of practice; to establish a Legal Career Service for improvement of legal services in Government; and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO PROVIDE TAX REVISION FOR SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 13382) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide tax revision for small business, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

PROGRAM OF SURVIVAL DEPOTS— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, with the knowledge and consent of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 4055) to establish a program of survival depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), on June 25, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF REFERENCE OF HOUSE BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate on yesterday received two bills passed on the previous day by the House of Representatives, namely, H. R. 12728 and H. R. 13021, both amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

H. R. 12728 was shown in the House Calendar as a companion bill of S. 3486 reported from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on July 1, 1958, which amended the act in respect to safety rules, and the House bill, under the practice, was placed on the calendar. However, the House bill amends the act with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

H. R. 13021 is the corresponding bill to S. 3486.

In order to correct the situation, I ask that H. R. 12728 be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 13021, and that it be placed on the calendar with a cross reference to Senate bill 3486, Calendar No. 1823.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT TO FILE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on yesterday, July 31, the Special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, under authority of Senate Resolution 241, expired. As we know, the work of that subcommittee has now been taken over by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I had intended yesterday to ask unanimous consent for permission to file a report, but the Senate adjourned before I could do so. Therefore, today I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under authority of Senate Resolution 241, agreed to January 29, 1958, have permission to file a final report with necessary illustrations during the second session or adjourned periods of the 85th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Article entitled "Turning Point for Disarmament," written by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and published in the Progressive magazine for August 1958.

PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], together with an attachment, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and attachment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

On July 29, 1958, the junior Senator from Massachusetts and I engaged in an amicable colloquy with reference to the so-called Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill. Just prior to my questioning of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, he alleged that the Kennedy-Ives bill was dead as the result of unscrupulous lobbying by representatives of business in the United States. He specifically called the attention of the Senate, as well as the country at large, to a Labor Gram issued by the American Retail Federation and characterized this particular issue of the Labor Gram as misleading junk.

I stated on the floor at that time that I felt the junior Senator from Massachusetts whole thesis about the alleged demise of the Kennedy-Ives bill was fallacious but I do not care to carry that any further at this time. I do feel, however, in fairness to the American Retail Federation that their side of the story should be taken into consideration.

I am attaching herewith, therefore, the July 30 memorandum of the American Retail Federation concerning Senator KENNEDY's speech. From a perusal of this memorandum it will be noted that the Labor Gram from which Senator KENNEDY quoted in his speech had nothing whatsoever to do

with the Kennedy-Ives bill, but was a discussion of the recently announced NLRB jurisdictional standards.

I think it only fair that this matter be brought to the attention of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, so he can correct his original statement.

THE NATIONAL ACTION TEAM
FOR RETAILING,
July 30, 1958.

To All Members:

Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, on the floor of the United States Senate made charges to the effect that a group of trade associations including the American Retail Federation operated as a secret government and holds up vital labor legislation needed by the public. This we categorically deny.

We also take exception with the Senator from Massachusetts when he refers to the ARF Labor Gram as misleading junk. We respectfully suggest to the Senator that he read the article from the Labor Gram from which he partially quoted on page 15425 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29. The Senator quotes the July 23 issue of the Labor Gram as indicating that the Kennedy-Ives bill would enlarge the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board so as to cover more retailers. This is not true, he says. We agree because, as a matter of fact, the article from which the Senator's quote is taken is entitled "NLRB Jurisdictional Standards." The article was discussing the effect on retailers of the NLRB's recently announced policy to enlarge its own jurisdictional standards and take jurisdiction over more retailers. The article did not mention the Kennedy-Ives bill, nor did it purport to do so. In our opinion, it is misleading for anyone to take an excerpt from an article discussing an action in which the NLRB decides to take jurisdiction over more retailers and apply these comments as interpreting the meaning of a bill being considered by Congress.

The American Retail Federation, acting through its duly constituted employee relations committee reached unanimous agreement that certain provisions of the Kennedy-Ives labor bill would raise havoc with a retailer's freedom to maintain a good personnel program. Immediately after the Senate passed the bill—S. 3974—we wrote to the House Labor Committee and asked for time to testify on the bill and discuss these sections—103 and 607.

When it became apparent that certain Congressional leaders intended to bypass the Labor Committee and pass the bill without holding public hearings on it, we took the only course left to us and told Main Street retailers what was being done.

It was these retailers who recognized the seriousness of the situation. We are proud to say that they responded to ARF's alert in a manner which is a tribute to their sincere desire to protect their employees.

Retailers are traditionally an independent group of persons and no trade association can make them write to their Congressmen if they do not believe that which they write.

ARF made its own evaluation of the situation and policy-wise acted independent of the wishes of either the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce. It just so happens that their opinion of the bill agreed with ours.

The American Retail Federation never has—and never will—condemn honest efforts at labor reforms. Nor do we favor an all-or-nothing policy. However, we do believe that Congress must follow the time tested legislative process and not pass a labor bill without first finding out what each and every line of it means.

ROWLAND JONES, Jr.

JAMES L. McDEVITT, OF THE AFL-CIO COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the labor bosses are primed and ready to flood the American political arteries with over \$3 million, and to dispatch a vast army of politically trained men and women into the field, in the coming primary and general election campaigns.

The labor bosses are training their big guns on the months ahead for a definite reason: They want to elect to the 86th Congress a substantial majority of Representatives and Senators who will do their bidding, and they want to return to the White House, in 1960, an administration which will be subservient to their wishes—as the Roosevelt and Truman administrations were, from 1932 to 1952.

The labor bosses want this total control over Government, so they can force enactment of the economic, business, and labor legislation which will strengthen their hold on the rank-and-file laboring man, and will bring business and industry to their knees before the consolidated power of the monopoly which the labor bosses control.

The labor bosses want to have enacted legislation which will throw a roadblock in front of the Nation's courts—which defend the rights of the rank-and-file workers, and may hand down decisions restraining wholesale political activities by the labor bosses.

The labor bosses want this undisputed control over the functions of government, in order to promote the socialistic and welfare-state policies to which they have been committed of late—since the welfare and working conditions of their individual members have ceased to be their primary concern.

James L. McDevitt, codirector of the AFL-CIO committee on political education, is the one man to whom the labor bosses have entrusted the tremendous task of spending over \$3 million, as well as guiding the actions of thousands of political workers in the coming months.

What are Mr. McDevitt's qualifications?

One way to answer this question is to review, briefly, the tactics of other labor bosses when they have been required to answer for their activities before the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

I have spent months, as a member of this committee, listening to the testimony of the labor bosses. It has been established in testimony that violence and flagrant violation of the law, as well as threats, intimidation, and character assassination, have highlighted the activities of some unions in the immediate past. When an attempt has been made to fix the responsibility for these blots on our national life, the labor bosses have wrung their hands in righteous indignation; they have pleaded total innocence; they have attempted to shift the blame to the rank-and-file membership.

In 9 cases out of 10—at least, in the UAW hearings—all the circumstantial evidence concerning the excesses and

transgressions of the labor unions points directly to the labor bosses. However, when they have come before our committee these union bosses have disclaimed any knowledge or responsibility for these excesses and transgressions, and have left the rank-and-file union members holding the bag.

Mr. McDevitt was before our committee on May 6. He, too, played the part of a completely innocent man who had been wronged by his associates. Perhaps Mr. McDevitt was innocent. But I, personally, cannot understand how a man charged with the responsibility of expending over \$3 million, and serving as commander in chief of the greatest political army ever assembled in this country, could be so naive.

The picture developed this way:

In 1946, when he was President of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, McDevitt hired a Mr. Lapensohn to secure, on behalf of the federation, advertisements for its yearbooks. Lapensohn continued in this operation until 1953. During this time, it turned out, he and his associates were "shaking down" employers to the tune of thousands of dollars—promising them labor peace if they advertised in the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor Yearbook. This "shakedown" operation was conducted through personal contacts and letters allegedly signed by McDevitt.

The details of this swindle, which was being perpetrated in the name of the organization McDevitt headed, were made known to a House committee in 1947. Two of Lapensohn's associates were ultimately indicted, but Lapensohn's contract was renewed year after year until 1953. Eventually he fled the jurisdiction; and the law has not been able to make him pay for his racket.

McDevitt claimed a hazy memory about all this. He testified that the hundreds of letters bearing his signature were sent out without his knowledge; but he did admit that when the strange activities of Lapensohn were being freely discussed in Congress and in the newspapers, the only action he took, as President of the Federation, was to refer the matter to the Federation's counsel. "It was a legal matter," he said, and he "didn't feel qualified" to pass on it himself.

I submit that a man who admittedly is not qualified to recognize a swindle when it is being perpetrated by one of his own lieutenants, and who admittedly is not qualified to take remedial action against that man, is not qualified to pick and choose the Senators and Representatives for whom organized labor will be expected to vote. I hope the individual members of our great labor unions will exercise their own good judgment in the months ahead, and will refuse to permit such men as McDevitt to dictate their choice of political candidates.

WHY ARE WE PUNISHING THE SCHOOLCHILDREN OF EGYPT?—VII

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we now come to the ugliest incident in the otherwise creditable history of our coun-

try. It is to our credit that we were providing from our great surplus nearly 1½ million pounds of butter, oil, powdered milk, and cheese per week for Egyptian schoolchildren. That flow of relief was stopped. Only in January of this year was the deplorable situation in Port Said recognized by the sending of 10,000 22-pound packages. The program should be reinstated as proposed by the second "whereas" of my resolution of July 18, Senate Concurrent Resolution 106.

Of all the poverty-stricken peoples of the world, none are more miserable than the Egyptian peasants of the Nile Valley. Nowhere on the earth's surface could the bounty of our overflowing harvests be more graciously distributed than to the undernourished children of that unfortunate population.

It was the idea of Nasser, the ruler of these people, that the building of a high dam at Aswan would store enough water to regularize and distribute a much greater flow, and produce far greater food crops than the valley had ever borne, even in the "Seven Years of Plenty." Negotiations had proceeded to the point where the World Bank was prepared to loan \$200 million, and our Government and that of Great Britain, by various means, a similar sum. The remainder of \$1,200,000,000 was to be furnished by Egyptian labor.

The history of the negotiations and the calamitous disruption of them can be read in the well documented book, *Will the Middle East Go West?* by Freda Utey. It is her theme that by ignorance and clumsiness we are losing the Arab world to the Communists, even as we lost China by the same mistaken attitudes.

The Egyptian Ambassador called at our State Department in July, 2 years ago, to accept the terms which had been agreed upon. The offer was withdrawn and the door slammed in his face.

There was no new incident. The 7-month-old Czech arms deal was well known, even if regrettable. There is no explanation of the insult to Nasser except that he was inconvenient and that we thought he could be discredited and destroyed.

So, we tried to discredit, among his own people, the man who was trying to get more food for them. To cap this brutal maneuver we cut off the CARE packages. That was 2 years ago. Food still pours into our storage bins. But it does not go on its old errand of mercy to underfed Egyptian children. By some tortured and perverted reasoning we are still trying to punish Nasser, and think this is a good way to do it.

There has been another regrettable effect of the State Department embargo on surplus food. CARE was recognized as a private organization by the Arabs. It was a people to people contact. This was most valuable. When our Government closed it off, it took on the status of an official organization and lost its favorable position in the public mind.

Mr. President, what committee, what official of our State Department is responsible for this brutal stupidity? Let him or them emerge from the teeming rabbit warren on 21st Street NW. Let

him or them stand forth and justify these acts before the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to Senator's comments relating to the cessation of the flow of food under the CARE program to Egypt. As the Senator knows, this was a matter about which I was deeply concerned and about which I expressed my concern to the Senate after a visit to Cairo, and after having talked to the CARE officials and Mr. Devine, the CARE representative in Cairo.

I expressed my concern in a report to the Senate and I urged the State Department to reinstate the CARE program. The food was available. The CARE program had operated very successfully. The Government of Egypt had cooperated wholeheartedly. In fact, the President of Egypt, Mr. Nasser, had appeared on television and radio programs with Mr. Devine of the CARE program thanking the people of the United States and thanking the CARE program for the assistance which had been given.

I spoke to the President of the United States about this matter on the occasion of my visit with him, since he was kind enough to grant me an opportunity to talk with him. I have talked with the Secretary of State about the matter.

Like the Senator from Vermont, I cannot understand why this program was stopped. I cannot understand why the program continues to be blocked, and I have never been able to ascertain who really blocked it.

I thank the Senator for saying what he has said. This is organized stupidity.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think the Senator has used an excellent phrase, "organized stupidity."

THE NEED FOR INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, yesterday was a bright and happy day for millions of American old people. By a smashing 375-to-2 vote, the House of Representatives passed a bill which will increase social security benefits. Throughout America our old people firmly expect that the Senate of the United States will live up to its responsibility with a generous heart and spirit and mind. I earnestly hope so. Mr. President, to be bluntly realistic, there are roadblocks, serious roadblocks, standing in the way of the fond goal of our senior citizens. The decision, the responsibility, is up to the Senate of the United States. I plead with my fellow Senators that in the name of humanity we act.

Mr. President, the minimum payments for a woman who retires at 62 are as little as \$24 a month. It is not humanly possible to live in anything but abject poverty on about 80 cents a day.

To compound this tragedy, prices continue to go higher and higher, despite the depression. Social-security payments obviously do not reflect the higher wages of the present time; they are

based on earnings during an earlier period, when wage levels were lower and when prices were lower, too.

Mr. President, the victims of our neglect to modernize social security are the very same people who built the great productive capacity of this Nation. Their labor in our factories and farms made possible the wealth and power America enjoys today. And now, because of a faulty and inequitable distribution of this wealth, many of these same people go hungry while our warehouses brim full with surplus grains and milk and butter.

Millions of Americans live on pitifully inadequate social security benefits today because, through no fault of their own, inflation has stolen away the earning power of the social security contributions they made during their working years. Justice demands that Congress act now to increase these benefits to a reasonable, adequate level.

Mr. President, social-security benefits of 11 million retired Americans have been doubly squeezed into inadequacy. In their earning years, these retired people suffered economic depression, unemployment, and low wages. Now their retirement benefits reflect past low earnings and are further shrunk by rising prices. These people deserve increased social-security benefits now.

Mr. President, not a day goes by without my receiving more requests for help from constituents who cannot make ends meet on their social-security payments. I have here a letter from Mrs. Charles Smith, of 6523 West Fremont Place, in Milwaukee. Mrs. Smith is 66 and cannot find work because she is crippled, with an artificial limb. She and her husband, who is 75, live together on their social-security payment of \$65.50 a month. Mrs. Smith writes that the letter is her plea for more social security. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Smith's letter printed in the RECORD at this point, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: I read your folder you sent out and surely agree with you that the social security is not enough for old people to live on. Especially those who are old now and need it. When we were working years ago there was no such thing as social security, so as the result my husband and I together get \$65.50 per month, which is not enough to pay rent and fuel and living. I am crippled with an artificial limb and cannot work, also have a heart condition. My husband is 75 years old and tries to mow lawns to help us out. He also has a bad heart condition, too. We are too proud to ask for relief. So far we were living with my daughter, but they have a family of their own and have told us to move out. So what we could save with my husband's work we bought a secondhand, small trailer, but where can we park it. We can't afford to park in a trailer camp where they charge \$35, half of our social-security check. I guess the only place is a county home, where my husband and I would be separated. We don't want that as he is all I have and I am all he has to live for. So I say the social security that the old folks get is not enough. I will be 66 years old in

October. I also have diabetes with the heart condition.

You can print this if you like. It is my plea for more social security.

Mrs. CHARLES SMITH.

SOUTHERN DETERMINATION TO RETAIN LOCAL CONTROL OVER PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in his column in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, David Lawrence correctly interprets the determination of the people of the South to maintain their social order and to retain local control over their public school systems.

Mr. Lawrence also vividly points out the error of the Supreme Court of the United States in attempting to usurp the legislative functions of Congress.

This column serves to emphasize anew what responsible southern leaders have been trying to tell the Nation for 4 years now—that the social order of the South cannot be changed by judicial edict or the force of Federal bayonets—and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS AND THE CONSTITUTION—FAUBUS VOTE HELD RETURN TO THE LAW AS WRITTEN, NOT AS INTERPRETED

Maybe it's a demonstration of Arkansas nationalism we are witnessing—though perhaps "statism" is a more fitting word—but for some reason not clearly understood in the North the people of Arkansas, by the biggest landslide in their voting history, have just assured a third term for Governor Faubus.

Isn't this the man, it will be asked, who defied the supreme law of the land? Don't the people of Arkansas know what the law of the land is, or have they come to the conclusion that maybe the law of the land is what the Constitution says it is and not what nine justices say it is? For the Bill of Rights in the Constitution does say that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The people of Arkansas weighed all the arguments and decided to back the Constitution as it is written. They had listened for nearly a year to radio and television speeches of abuse and had read many articles in the press telling them they are lawless folks who don't obey the orders of the Federal courts. The Arkansas voters had protested in vain that critics in other States were oversimplifying the issue by saying that it was merely that man Faubus and a few zealots who were responsible for the crisis in the schools of Arkansas and that, if the present Governor were not in office, things would be different.

Now the people of Arkansas, in a free and fair election, have given their answer. They have voted by an overwhelming majority—about 70 percent of all ballots cast—to retain Governor Faubus. It's a break in tradition to give a third term to a governor in Arkansas. It was, therefore, an electorate deeply stirred which threw precedent aside in order to say to the rest of the States of the Union that Arkansas craves the privilege of deciding for itself how it shall educate its children.

For, up to 1954, education was considered to be solely a State problem, with no right to the Federal Government to assign pupils

to public schools, much less to send Federal troops to police the corridors of school buildings. But, while the Supreme Court 4 years ago vetoed segregation, it has not yet prescribed a formula for integration. Other States besides Arkansas are struggling with the same problem of how to retain control of their schools and yet keep them from being interfered with by the Supreme Court's edicts.

There wouldn't have been any such rumpus in Arkansas or in any other Southern State if the Congress, as specifically provided in the 14th amendment, had passed a law compelling desegregation. But for the Supreme Court suddenly to turn down its own 58-year-old order for separate but equal facilities in the schools by terming it now a violation of the 14th amendment—especially since the Court, itself, could not find the slightest bit of history to show that the framers of that amendment intended to take over control of educational systems of the States—is to arouse the people to demand that the law of the land, namely, the Constitution, itself, be followed. The 14th amendment stipulates that "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." This never has been done. The Supreme Court, moreover, isn't supposed to exercise any legislative power.

It is significant that the two candidates opposing Governor Faubus in the Democratic Party primary in Arkansas expressed themselves in favor of segregation in the schools, although they differed on how the formula is to be applied.

There is no doubt that the renomination of Governor Faubus in the Democratic primary—which is equivalent to election because there is no effective Republican Party in the State—will be regarded in other Southern States as encouragement and moral support.

Every Southern State would vote on the segregation issue exactly as has Arkansas. The same American "liberals" who are so quick to recognize as legitimate the aspirations of the Arabs or the Algerians or other nationalities to autonomous rights seem to forget that even in the United States there are aspirations to self-government by units known as the several States. When the Constitution was written, all the people were told that the States were never to be deprived of their sovereignty except under the means prescribed in the Constitution itself, for amending that document. States rights have since suffered as the Federal Government has gradually centralized more and more economic power in Washington. But where questions of sentiment and customs are concerned, the doctrine of States rights is as alive and as virile today as it was when Thomas Jefferson first taught it.

It is time for a more constructive approach to the problem of segregation and integration. It's an issue that can be resolved only by patience, reason, and tolerance of lengthy debate—and certainly not by bayonets.

SYSTEMS OF INSPECTION FOR SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the State Department released the text of a note from the American Embassy in Moscow to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating the willingness of the United States to go ahead with a technical conference on prevention of surprise attack.

As we know, Mr. President, the United States is now engaged at Geneva with the Soviet Union in a conference on the

technical aspects of inspection for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests. I have had some reports from that conference, and I am pleased to say they are all optimistic. The reports demonstrate considerable progress. According to the proposal today of the United States, the present conference would be followed by another similar conference in October on safeguards against surprise attack.

Mr. President, I heartily endorse the proposal made by the State Department. The device of joint technical conferences to work out systems of inspection is a new approach to the disarmament problem. It is one I myself proposed on several occasions. It has been proposed in many areas of our country and by many persons.

In an earlier speech on this floor in February, I said:

With respect to the requirements for both the inspection system for a cutoff or production and for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, I propose that the executive branch appoint two teams of prominent and highly qualified nuclear scientists and weapons experts. One should be charged with making a complete and thorough study of the requirements of inspection for a test ban; the other group for inspection for a cutoff of production. These two groups should offer to meet with comparable scientists and nuclear experts from the Soviet Union in order to devise inspection systems acceptable to both countries. If the U. S. S. R. refuses both of these proposals then we should try such a proposal on the nongovernmental level. The United States National Academy of Sciences could appoint two teams of weapons experts. These teams might then negotiate with the Soviet Academy of Sciences to determine whether they could agree on the necessary requirements of an inspection system to verify a test ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

Although the current Geneva parley has not made its final report, the communiqués issued to date indicate that this approach has great potentiality for advancing the cause of international disarmament.

I predict that the Geneva Conference now under way will come forth with some sound and constructive proposals which will meet with the agreement and approval of the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America scientists. The State Department's decision to follow through with a proposal for a second conference on the subject of surprise attack is constructive and commendable. I underscore its importance, and commend the State Department and the Secretary for this very splendid initiative.

My only regret is that in the State Department's proposal there has to be a 2 months' delay before the Conference can convene. In a day when bombing aircraft can span oceans in a matter of hours and long-range missiles can flash thousands of miles in a matter of minutes agreement by this country and Moscow on a method of preventing surprise attack could add substantially to international confidence and security. The progress of military technology is so rapid that it threatens to get out of hand before any sort of disarmament controls can ever be agreed upon or put into effect.

The world has already delayed too long in coming to terms on methods of mitigating or ending the arms race. If the administration were well prepared on the subject of surprise attack, there should be no reason why we should have to wait 2 whole months before the Conference convenes. The Subcommittee on Disarmament months ago urged the administration to study the technical problems of inspection. In its report issued last fall, the subcommittee declared that it had received few details from the executive branch on inspection provisions. The subcommittee asserted, "It has been unable to learn, for example, how a ground inspection system would operate to guard against surprise attack." The subcommittee then went on to say, "The subcommittee strongly recommends that if inspection plans have not yet been prepared, an effort be made promptly by the executive branch to draw up blueprints for various types of inspection systems now under consideration." I think, Mr. President, that if these blueprints had been drawn up, that we could now proceed forthwith and without delay with this Conference on surprise attack and not have to wait 2 months while the world staggers from one crisis to another, in many of which the danger of surprise attack adds to the heat of international tension.

In any case, Mr. President, I think that the proposal for a technical conference on surprise attack can carry us another step forward toward a more peaceful day and I urge that the administration pursue it vigorously to a successful outcome. At this point, Mr. President, I would like to insert the text of the American note to the Soviet Foreign Affairs Ministry.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPRISE ATTACK

Following is the text of a note delivered today by the American Embassy at Moscow to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning the prevention of surprise attack:

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to the letters of May 9, 1958, and July 2, 1958, from Prime Minister Khrushchev to President Eisenhower with regard to the problem of preventing surprise attack. The Prime Minister's letters commented upon the proposals of the United States on this subject and advanced certain additional proposals of the Soviet Government. The Government of the United States would like now to reply to these letters insofar as they relate to this important question.

As President Eisenhower pointed out in his letter of April 28, 1958, the United States is determined that the Soviet Union and United States ultimately reach an agreement on disarmament. As an effective means of moving toward ultimate agreement, he proposed that technical experts start to work immediately upon the practical problems involved. In this connection, he raised the question whether both sides would not be in a better position to reach agreements if there were a common accepted understanding as to methods of inspecting against surprise attack. It is noted that Prime Min-

ister Khrushchev now suggests that appropriate representatives—including those of the military agencies of both sides, e. g., at the level of experts—designated by the Soviet Union, the United States and possibly by the governments of certain other states meet for a joint study of the practical aspects of this problem. Accordingly, the United States proposes that qualified persons from each side meet for a study of the technical aspects of safeguards against the possibility of surprise attack. They should concentrate on the means and objects of control, and on the results which could be secured from these safeguards.

The discussions could bear, if necessary, on the applicability of inspection measures to various areas for illustrative purposes only, but without prejudging in any way the boundaries within which such measures should be applied. It will be recalled that the United States has always favored the broadest possible application of such measures, and that in fact in President Eisenhower's initial proposal in 1955 he suggested that the entire territories of the United States and the Soviet Union be open to inspection. The United States assumes, on the basis of Prime Minister Khrushchev's letter of July 2, 1958, that the Soviet Government agrees that these discussions would take place without prejudice to the respective positions of the two Governments as to the delimitation of areas within which safeguards would be established, or as to the timing or interdependence of various aspects of disarmament. The United States does not agree that the particular areas to be supervised as against surprise attack should be those indicated by Prime Minister Khrushchev's letter of July 2, 1958.

In this connection, the Government of the United States must indicate disagreement with Prime Minister Khrushchev's statement that the proposals relating to zones of inspection against surprise attack put forward by the United States, United Kingdom, and France on May 28, 1958, fail to strike a balance between the interests of both sides. It is the zones of inspection proposed by the Soviet Government which are subject to this criticism. This is particularly true of the European zone proposal which covers only a very limited area, scarcely touching Russian territory and far too small to cover the areas from which a surprise attack would be launched under modern conditions. Moreover, this proposal seems to be motivated by the political desire to crystallize the present dividing line in Europe since it is calculated from the "line of demarcation" between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The United States believes, however, that joint technical studies would make it easier to reach agreement later at a political level on the definition of the regions in which the safeguards would apply. Accordingly, the United States proposes that during the first week of October, which is the earliest date by which preparations adequate to the significance and complexity of the task can be completed, these discussions begin in Geneva. In view of the Charter responsibilities of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the United States would propose to keep the United Nations informed of the progress of the talks through the Secretary General. Further arrangements for the meeting can be concluded through diplomatic channels.

In his letter of May 9, 1958, in particular, and again on July 2, 1958, Prime Minister Khrushchev also referred to the question of United States military flights especially in the Arctic area.

The United States regrets that unfounded charges continue regarding United States flights in the Arctic area and that the Soviet Union continues to reject United States pro-

posals for a timely international inspection system in this area which would serve the end which the Soviet Union proposes, namely, "to prevent this area from becoming a hot-bed of military conflict between our countries."

It is stated that the proposal of the United States for inspection in this area, a proposal which commanded general support not only in the United Nations Security Council but throughout the world, is no solution because the United States did not promise to suspend atomic bomber flights in the direction of the Soviet Union if an Arctic zone were established.

With respect to that statement, the United States desires to correct the apparent misunderstanding concerning atomic bomber operations of the United States. The greater portion of the Arctic zone airspace is internationally free. There is considerable military aviation activity in that area, participated in by the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations of the world. The statements of the Soviet representatives in the United Nations Security Council, however, indicate concern that in this or other areas military aircraft of the United States armed with hydrogen and atomic bombs may have been sent in the direction of the borders of the Soviet Union as a result of a misinterpreted radar blip or other false alert. The Government of the United States gives categorical assurances that the United States has never had the need to launch nor has it in fact ever launched any atomic bomber flights of this type. Furthermore, if dependable and adequate safeguards were to be provided against surprise attack, then, of course, any United States flights entering, leaving, or operating within an Arctic zone would conform to agreed control measures.

The United States believes that technical discussions of measures to reduce the possibility of surprise attack, even though made without reference to particular areas, will produce a fuller realization of the value of an Arctic zone, and pave the way for agreement on safeguards in this and other regions. Such technical discussion would also be helpful in determining whether a meeting of heads of Government would provide opportunity for conducting serious discussions of major problems and would be an effective means of reaching agreement on significant subjects.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "A-Weapons Detection System Can Be Workable, Study Says," written by Edward Gamarekian, of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This particular article refers to a study which has just been concluded at Columbia University. I commented upon this study the other day, but I find that this news item analyzes the study in a most concise and objective manner. It is indeed worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress. Mark my words, there is no subject more important before us now than a system of detection which is safeguarded and workable. There seems to be a tendency to work out such a system, which ultimately may come to the Congress for our ratification.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A-WEAPONS DETECTION SYSTEM CAN BE WORKABLE, STUDY SAYS

(By Edward Gamarekian)

A major obstacle in the way of disarmament has been the lack of a foolproof inspection system.

Fifty scientists, engineers, and specialists from the United States and abroad have just completed an exhaustive study which concludes:

That an absolutely foolproof system is impossible.

That the testing of nuclear weapons and missiles can be detected with almost absolute certainty by detection stations within a range of 300 miles.

That the production of such devices can be detected with a reasonable degree of certainty, although clandestine operations may go unnoticed.

That stockpiles already in existence can be readily hidden.

That the cutting off of missile production by a workable system of inspection might lead to other schemes of weapon delivery more difficult to detect, such as the transporting of nuclear bombs in suitcases or in items of trade.

Also that the cutting off of nuclear-weapon production may lead to alternate weapons, such as poisons, diseases, or radioactive devices which can be used against large numbers of people.

INSTITUTE BACKED STUDY

The study was organized by Seymour Melman, associate professor of industrial and management engineering at Columbia University. It was carried out as part of the program of Columbia's Institute of War and Peace Studies under a grant from the Institute for International Order, of New York.

In a summary statement accompanying the individual reports of the 50 participants, Melman concluded that "the strong points of inspection systems are more than sufficient to form the basis for an optimistic estimate of workability."

"The gains that could be obtained for the security of mankind by the relaxation of the arms race are so substantial," he added, "as to be well worth the risks of successful evasion that may be involved in concluding disarmament agreements."

The success of an inspection system, he emphasized, depended on complete freedom of movement by teams of competent scientists plus a willingness on the part of the native populace to cooperate and report suspected violations.

No secret or classified information was utilized in the preparation of any of the reports, according to Melman.

The Institute of War and Peace Studies was created in 1951, largely on the initiative of Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was then president of Columbia University. At the time, Mr. Eisenhower was on leave to head the allied armies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

An unusual technique was used during the overall study to give it added dimension. Three teams were set up to find ways of evading and outwitting all the known schemes of detection and inspection. Two were American and one was British.

Their objective was to be the preparation and maintenance of 200 to 400 intercontinental missiles, of existing design, in the conviction that the country was unsafe without them.

The conditions that were assumed to exist were (1) an international agreement destroying and prohibiting further production of all weapons of war, including conventional and biological weapons as well as nuclear explosives and their delivery systems, (2) an inspection group of the highest caliber with an ample budget and unrestricted access to places and people, (3) an international agreement making it obligatory for the citizens of all countries to report evidence of violations, and (4) a judicial and penal system for punishing violators as felons.

The evasion teams could also assume, however, that they had government support in the form of funds and authority. Their

plans would be carried out by a directorate consisting of senior military men, industrial executives, and one cabinet member.

CHANCES CONSIDERED

One evasion team, made up of Americans, concluded that the "chances for a successful clandestine arming operation are quite favorable, even in the presence of a very large inspectorate."

They described schemes for secretly producing missiles, stealing material for warheads, and using chemical and biological weapons.

The other team of Americans felt that effective inspection could be defeated by the failure of a nation to destroy its stockpile of weapons and also by the manufacture of peaceful goods whose components could be used to produce weapons.

The British team concluded that evasion in countries other than the United States and U. S. S. R. would be possible only on a small scale.

ACTIVITIES OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AT UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Victories in Security Council Almost Meaningless," written by Graham Hovey, a reporter at the United Nations for the Minneapolis Star-Tribune, and a well-known foreign correspondent. I ask to have this article printed in the body of the RECORD, inasmuch as it relates to the activities of our Government at the United Nations Security Council, and the methods and means we are now using to obtain support for American proposals. This article has caused most grave concern. Mr. Hovey is an objective reporter and a keen student of international affairs. If what he says as to the methods we are using and the difficulties we are encountering is true, we are really in trouble.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES VICTORIES IN SECURITY COUNCIL ALMOST MEANINGLESS

(By Graham Hovey)

United States victories in United Nations Security Council voting have become practically meaningless.

American insistence on driving for almost automatic majorities is eroding further the prestige of a Security Council already badly damaged by Russia's flagrant abuse of the big-power veto.

These things were brought home again last week by Council votes on resolutions aimed at easing the Middle East crisis. After watching 9 of 11 members vote for the United States resolution to send a U. N. armed force to Lebanon, only to have it vetoed by Soviet Ambassador Arkady Sobolev, a veteran Asian correspondent whose friendship for America cannot be doubted told this reporter:

"Your delegation's zeal for rolling up council majorities—no less than the Soviet vetoes—has brought the Security Council into utter disrepute."

His point was that the familiar 9-to-1 majorities for United States-sponsored resolutions (neutral Sweden abstaining) rarely reflect the state of world opinion or even the lineup of the 81 U. N. member governments.

Mostly they reflect the views of the United States Government and its allies.

One simple fact will demonstrate how far the present Security Council member-

ship comes from reflecting the true world power balance; how stacked it is for the United States and its allies:

Seven of the other ten Council members have outright military alliances with the United States and an eighth, Iraq, had at least unofficial security ties to this country through the Baghdad Pact.

Britain, France, and Canada are allied with the United States in NATO; Columbia and Panama are our allies in the inter-American defense treaty; Japan and Nationalist China each has a bilateral military alliance with our Government.

Only Soviet Russia and Sweden on the present council stand entirely apart from the globe-encircling network of United States military alliances. And the Asian-African group of cold-war neutrals is not represented.

For some years an unofficial gentlemen's agreement between Russia and the West resulted in the regular election of one Eastern European Communist government to the Council.

The United States ignored this agreement 2 years ago to back the Philippines and repeated the process last year to support Japan's successful bid for a term on the Council. This scrapping of what had been regarded as an accepted formula aroused resentment not only in the Soviet bloc but outside as well.

But the United States is not entirely to blame for the present Council lineup. Some new nations of Asia and Africa—especially those with an internal Communist problem—are not overly eager to bask in the Security Council spotlight and accept the pressures from East and West that membership involves.

"By any standard of measure, however," said my Asian colleague, "it makes no sense to have two Council members from Latin America. And, of course, it is fantastic to have a man who actually represents only Formosa holding the permanent Council seat that the charter assigned to China."

"If the Council continues to refuse to seat the representative of Iraq's new revolutionary regime, the picture will become even more fantastic. There will be two fictional representatives at the Council table."

He referred to the fact that the Council last week took no action to expel Abdul Majid Abbass, U. N. delegate of the overthrown Iraqi Government.

It has long been obvious to veteran U. N. observers that something should be done about the security council in an attempt to arrest the erosion of the organization's political machinery.

This job may require some imagination and some pride swallowing by the United States. For most authorities who have expressed themselves on the matter favor an expanded Security Council to include India and eventually Communist China as permanent members.

In terms of its power potential and present political influence, particularly with the expanding Asian-African group of nations, India is entitled to a permanent Council seat. If eventual admission of Red China to the U. N. is conceded, the United States conceivably might insist on a permanent seat for India as a balancing Asian factor.

Such an expanded Council would not be perfect. It would not by itself necessarily save the U. N. It would not even guarantee less frequent use of the veto by Russia.

Its proponents believe, however, that it could make for a healthier U. N. because it would come ever so much closer to an accurate reflection of the existing power and political balance in the world.

They believe it might even have a leavening effect on Russia by removing the Soviet delegate from the complete isolation in which he must function on the Council—

an isolation that sometimes elicits sympathy for him and even defense of his defiant vetoes in strongly anti-Communist circles.

FARMERS PROTEST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was a sad day for agriculture when this body bowed to Secretary Benson by enacting a farm bill hailed by the city press as heading our farm policies in a new direction. As I insisted throughout the farm debate, I am convinced it is the wrong direction.

During the farm debate, I expressed regret that the American Farm Bureau Federation had so far abandoned the principles upon which it grew to power under the late Ed O'Neal. I indicated that I felt the views of its national spokesmen failed to accurately reflect the feelings of many of its farmer members.

I call attention to a letter I have just received from the legislative committee of the Cochran County Farm Bureau in Texas, echoing that sentiment. The letter was written last Friday, before the Senate had concluded action, but it was not received by me until yesterday.

Signed by three members of the Texas Farm Bureau's legislative committee, it speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD as evidence of how farmers really feel.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORTON TEX., July 25, 1958.

MR. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We would like to submit to you some of the ideas developed and recommended by the members of our organization with reference to agricultural legislation, as follows:

First, we want you to know that the National Farm Bureau does not speak our sentiments nor our wishes. It does not represent the farmers wishes in Washington, but the thinking of the national office. We think that if the Farm Bureau was stripped of its service organizations, wherein its members make huge savings in all types of insurance (this amount would be of interest to you, it runs into millions of dollars), the number of its members they come and tell you they represent would drop rapidly. The number of its members who do not have an interest in a farm would also be revealing and of interest. It is not a requirement that its members be farmers, and thousands are not.

Second, we hope that legislation on cotton can wait until after the national referendum on the program is held this fall, where only cottongrowers are allowed to vote. This will give the best idea as to what the farmers want.

Third, we believe that the farmers will never prosper as a producer of raw materials, leaving the marketing and processing to other groups. Has, or can, any other industry prospered by following this process? The CCC and support prices are the salvation to farmers welfare. Without them all agriculture will become integrated in a short time.

Fourth, if we have a surplus of cotton, as Secretary Benson says, and which we do not have (we now have the shortest supply of cotton since 1954, following 3 years of uncontrolled production), why raise the allotment and cut the prices, as Benson sug-

gests, along with the National Farm Bureau?

Fifth, we do not think agriculture can survive a free market, where they sell all their produce on a "what cha gimme market" and buy on a price tag.

Sixth, if the Secretary of Agriculture would spend some time and energy explaining to consumer groups that it is not the price of farm products that is responsible for increased food costs, but the handlers and processors, after it leaves the farms; for instance, the dairyman gets about 8 cents a quart for his milk at the farm, the egg man about 35 cents per dozen, potatoes are now 2 cents per pound, tomatoes 2½ cents, onions 2½ cents, and thousands of tons of produce are rotting in the fields for the lack of cost of production prices; and, what are you paying for these products as a consumer? We think that cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and all other supported products would follow the same pattern. We know that they will say, "Oh, yes; look at the cattlemen, the hog men, and the sheepmen"—well if they do, ask them to look back at them a few years ago when hundreds of them went broke.

Seventh, you have been hounded in Washington with this group and that group telling you that they represent the farmers; but, have you become aware that few of them do. Too many groups are spending a lot of time in Washington to tell you what they want, under the guise of farmer representatives. The processors and handlers of farm products are not interested in the welfare of the farmer—they are interested in volume and units of production. Controls are socialistic and communistic when applied to agriculture, but become very effective weapons with all major industries, where the board of directors set the policies; and, then the same process is termed sound business without a "tic" on it.

We just wanted you to know some of the thinking which has been developed down here in Texas, where no one was present but actual farmers, and hope that you and the other gentlemen in Washington will not let the Secretary of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau representatives destroy the foundation of our price support and CCC programs for agriculture, and that you realize the importance of a prosperous agriculture.

Respectively,

ROY HICKMAN,
GENE BENHAM,
MERLYN ROBERTS,

Legislative Committee for Cochran
County Farm Bureau.

P. S.—Why eliminate the present parity concept for those beginning in 1961, based on 90 percent of the prices received by farmers during the 3 preceding years, which will mean lower and lower prices?

Proposed legislation will create a surplus cotton problem similar to corn. The big increased allotments with lower prices will bring this about, and it will be the fault of the Democrats who are in control, and the problem for the 1960 administration to correct. Why should the present legislation go beyond 1960?

Why not include an escalator clause to take care of increased farming costs?

Please don't let Benson and company destroy the basis of our agricultural program, they are trying. R. H.

MINING RESEARCH STATION IN MINNESOTA—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed by my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that the Interior Department has undertaken the establishment of a

mining research station in Minnesota, thereby achieving the objective sought by Calendar No. 482, S. 98, to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota, as well as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, approves of removing the bill from the Senate Calendar, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I approve of the request of the distinguished majority leader. I want the RECORD to note that the metallurgical research establishment is being constructed, not because of the consent or with help of the Bureau of the Budget or the administration. It is being built because Congress insisted upon it. Authority for its construction has been provided in existing law. It was once approved by the Bureau of the Budget, in 1952, but such approval has not been given since then. I am grateful to Congress for the cooperation which it has extended to the State of Minnesota in making this metallurgical establishment a reality.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that, following the convening of the Senate on Monday, tributes will be paid to the late Senator Scott, of North Carolina, and the late Senator Neely, of West Virginia.

THE AIRWAYS MODERNIZATION BOARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the American Aviation magazine of July 28, 1958, in which the magazine acknowledges and gives due recognition to the effective efforts of some of our most competent public servants.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

ORCHIDS

The things that men do wrong, or the things that men don't do that they should be doing, most often get top attention in conversation and in print, especially editorials.

A report is overdue on three important Government jobs which we believe are being well done.

First, is Presidential Assistant Elwood "Pete" Quesada, who is confounding all of the skeptics and critics by turning in a terrific performance by all of the usual standards of measurement. He is carrying a dual

load—Airways Modernization Board and Presidential Aid—with bustling dispatch and sound judgment.

Second is CAA Administrator Jim Pyle, who inherited a mass of problems and a laggard organization. With workloads and headaches worse than ever, he has proved to be a nimble, able administrator not afraid to make decisions and not afraid to stick out his neck. Only in the international field, where he inherited an exceptionally bad situation, has he failed to produce solid results to date.

Third is George Borsari, who took over a few months ago the hefty task of heading up the CAA Airports Division—a bigger and more important job than the title would imply. What was needed here was an ability to organize, to make decisions and to get things moving. Borsari is doing all of this.

It is an all-too-common practice in Government to postpone decisions, buck a problem to another office, find some excuse for not making a decision that might make somebody unhappy, and to hope that if a problem hangs around long enough it will just disappear. Decision-making is one of the most vital keys to good administration. Whether or not everybody likes what Messrs. Quesada, Pyle, or Borsari are doing, these men deserve the highest tribute for moving ahead and making decisions.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 2 days ago on the floor of the Senate, during the course of the consideration of the Defense Department appropriations bill, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made what seemed to me to be a brilliant, if not indeed frightening, speech on the inadequacy of our Armed Forces. During the course of that debate he had occasion to deplore what seemed to be the disappearance of any sense of urgency in the country toward our defense posture. This sense of urgency had been aroused by sputnik, but it has been dissipated, despite the efforts of our distinguished majority leader and his Preparedness Subcommittee and a number of other Senators to keep it alive.

Last night, in the Evening Star, there appeared an article by Mr. Constantine Brown entitled "The Menace of Disinterest—Events Across World Seen Affecting All in United States, Including 'So What' Tribe."

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF DISINTEREST (By Constantine Brown)

There are a lot of Smiths and Joneses in the United States. But there is a name more legion than either of these old reliables, although it never appears in telephone directories. The name is "Sowhat."

A typical Sowhat, or So What, if you will, may be found in every city and town, every country crossroads store, every club and bar in America. Oftentimes Mr. So What will be a leader in his community, a civic worker, a churchgoer. He may be, and often is, a member of a legislature or a city council. He is prosperous in business or in one of the professions. He is level-headed, sound, careful, thoughtful, responsible, and conservative.

But when something comes along outside the ken of his daily activities, something

having to do with events and developments far from his own habitat, he spreads his hands, shrugs his shoulders and says, "So what?"

So, what if the Russians are fomenting strife and discord in the Middle East (or Asia, or Africa, or South America)? That's a long way from here. Besides, what can we do about it? What do we care if a bunch of bedsheet-wearing desert nomads get worked up about whatever sheikh or sultan or king they happen to have, and shoot a few people while they look for a new government?

Why, asks Mr. So What crossly, are we talking about intervention, sending American troops into foreign climes, spending billions of dollars on foolishness, just to try meddling in some foreign matter that has nothing to do with the daily routine in which Mr. So What has his complacent being?

Above all, complains Mr. So What, why are our Senators down there in Washington and our President and the Secretary of State and all those officials great and small spending all their time fooling around with all this foreign talk when they need to get down to business and get business up for us Americans?

And why are all those politician fellows getting all worked up about a few American-type Communists and their pals who might like to betray their country's survival to a foreign ideology and a menacing military aggressor?

The trouble with Mr. So-what, all thousands of him, is that he stops at the questions. He asks why because he is annoyed at the disturbance to his comfortable ways. But his why does not bestir him to find out why.

And the tragedy is that Mr. So-what, as we said when we introduced him, is not a dolt, a ne'er-do well, or even a run-of-the-mill citizen. He is a leader, or is looked up to as such, at least, in his community. Yet he sets the example to his fellow citizens of lesser stature, and the example is the hands-spread-out "so what" when matters lie outside his immediate interest.

It may be submitted that this So-what fellow is probably more of a danger to the Free World, to freedom in America and everywhere else in the still-remaining and rapidly dwindling area of the world that is free, than 10 times his number of diligent Communist agents, or a hundred times his number of just plain Communist subjects.

If one is to argue with a So-what, the annoyed reply one gets is petulant, "What can I do about it, anyway?" The answer to that one is just "plenty." Not at all by getting all excited and frenzied, worked up into a lather, or emotionally intoxicated. But just getting familiar with the world situation, at the same time realizing, like the great English poet, John Donne, that "every man's death diminishes me, for I am a part of mankind." Putting the two together—a knowledge of events and their significance, plus the realization that in this shrinking world no man can resign from the common destiny of mankind—will bring an end to the So-whats quite definitely.

These days the events taking place in the Middle East, in Asia or Africa or Greenland or Antarctica, are of immediate concern to the men and women of the United States. They can and probably will affect the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in America, not to mention the millions of people everywhere else.

Perhaps we who deplore the So-whats can begin by making every one we meet provide the answers to his own querulous question.

Mr. CLARK. I believe it would be wise for all readers of the RECORD to take note of Mr. Brown's comment that—

These days, the events taking place in the Middle East, in Asia or Africa or Greenland

or Antarctica are of immediate concern to the men and women of the United States. They can and probably will affect the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in America, not to mention the millions of people everywhere else.

This matter was even more clearly brought to the attention of the American people in a column appearing this morning in the Washington Post entitled "Untruths on Defense," written by Joseph Alsop. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNTRUTHS ON DEFENSE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The time has come, once again, to take a very grave step in this space. It is time to say quite bluntly that the Eisenhower administration is guilty of gross untruth concerning the national defense of the United States.

The false claims were most succinctly put by the President himself in his last state of the Nation message.

"We have now," he told the country, "a broadly based and efficient defensive strength, including a great deterrent power. But unless we act wisely and promptly, we could lose (the) capacity to deter attack or defend ourselves." He then outlined the action he proposed to take and he concluded with this promise: "We intend to assure that our vigilance, power, and technical excellence keep abreast of any realistic threat that we face."

Either the President was consciously misleading the Nation, or he silently decided to break his promise later on, or he has been misinformed about the facts. The third alternative is not only preferable; it is also highly probable. But that does not change the hard facts about which the President has been misinformed. Nothing will change them but a vastly greater national effort to keep abreast of the realistic threat we face.

The time of deadly danger will begin soon, during the period the Pentagon calls "the gap"—the years between 1960 through 1963 or 1964. Massive orders for hardware must be placed immediately—indeed, they should have been placed last winter—if we are going to make the feeblest pretense of keeping abreast during the years of the gap.

The prospective results of our present, fantastically inadequate effort were given in detail in the last report in this space. They may be summarized as follows:

First, we shall retain a modest margin of superiority in manned bombers throughout the years of the gap—unless the Kremlin puts its new, very long-range, supersonic jet bomber into early production, as must of course be expected. (It is not expected by the administration, but all the administration's expectations are based on the kind of reading of the grim intelligence that experience has repeatedly warned against.)

Second, the NATO estimates give the Soviets a strength in air defense that is at least 2 times, if not 3 or 4 times greater than our own air-defense strength; and this wide margin of superiority will be maintained throughout the years of the gap. This means, of course, that the balance of manned bomber strength must be weighed in favor of the Soviets; for our manned bombers are now increasingly vulnerable to interception by the more advanced defensive weapons.

Third, we shall be sending a few intermediate range missiles to our NATO allies in the gap years. Meanwhile, the Soviets will acquire between 1,000 and 2,000 ballistic missiles with suitable ranges to neutralize

or destroy all our overseas air bases, on which the striking power of our manned bomber force heavily depends. And fourth, the United States versus U. S. S. R. score in operational intercontinental missiles in the gap years will be United States, no intercontinental ballistic missiles versus U. S. S. R., 100 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1959; United States, 30 intercontinental ballistic missiles versus U. S. S. R., 500 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1960; United States, 70 intercontinental ballistic missiles versus U. S. S. R., 1,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1961; United States, 130 intercontinental ballistic missiles (plus a few submarine-borne Polaris, perhaps) versus U. S. S. R., 1,500 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1962; and United States, 130 intercontinental ballistic missiles (plus more Polaris) versus U. S. S. R., 2,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1963.

Furthermore, only a few score more of the Navy's Polaris missiles will alter the balance in 1964. And the first solid-fueled Minuteman missile, on which the Pentagon is gambling the American future, cannot possibly be ready for operational use before the end of 1963 or early 1964. It will probably be later than this.

If this is keeping abreast, one would like to know how the administration defines falling behind. The effect of the present policy is indisputable. It will allow the Soviets to gain an overwhelming superiority in overall nuclear striking power. And if anyone wonders what results to expect from this kind of Soviet superiority, it is only necessary to look back a few years, to the last time this reporter took the same grave step of charging official untruth about the national defense.

This was when the egregious Louis A. Johnson was swearing he was only cutting fat, not muscle. The Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament policy ended in the Korean war. But at least President Truman and Louis Johnson then had the excuse that the United States still possessed a virtual monopoly of nuclear striking power.

Now we are flaccidly letting the Soviets gain an overwhelming superiority in this crucial area where once we enjoyed a monopoly. We are doing this, moreover, after abandoning superiority to the Soviets in almost all other arms areas. Can any sane man suppose that this folly is not immeasurably more dangerous than the follies of Louis Johnson or can any sane man seriously suppose that the end result will not be immeasurably more terrible? At this instant, the last chance to save ourselves is slipping through our hands.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, this article is a follow-up of the one placed in the RECORD during the course of the speech by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] 2 days ago. I say now, as I said then, that these articles, written by Mr. Alsop, require—indeed, demand—an answer by the Pentagon and the Department of Defense, if not by the White House.

I firmly believe that the American people are entitled to know whether what Mr. Alsop says is true. If it is true, we should be moving forward with far more serious steps than we are taking at present.

MR. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret that I was unable to be in the Chamber

yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], reluctantly asked the Senate to agree to the conference report on the budget for the District of Columbia. As the Senator from Rhode Island so well said at that time, that budget is unsound, it is unbalanced, and under it an adequate Federal payment from the Federal Treasury to the District of Columbia is not made. Inevitably, it will cause great difficulty when Congress reconvenes in January.

This point of view has been so well expressed and so much better stated than I could state it by an editorial entitled "Who's Head in the Sand?" published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, that I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE HEAD IN THE SAND?

Congress shamefully flubbed its obligation as the policy-making body of the District in passing the 1959 appropriations bill. In the first place, it reduced appropriations to the skimpy level of \$204 million by eliminating many items of importance to the community. The Senate had added \$2.9 million to the barebones budget approved by the House, but in the conference all but \$757,360 of this was wiped out, with the acquiescence of both Houses. The Senate usually has good intentions in regard to the District, but in the end it gives way to the more stubborn House conferees who seem to make a religion of imposing austerity on the voteless Capital.

Even more disturbing was the niggardly squeeze applied to the Federal payment to the District. Congress had recently raised the legal ceiling on this payment from \$23 to \$32 million in recognition of the numerous services the Federal Government receives from the District and of the Federal interest in Washington as the Nation's Capital. Congress, instead of living up to its implied promise, appropriated a meager \$20 million. Its action reminds us of the star boarder who presided at the head of the table, took the best of everything and left a quarter to pay for it.

The foolishness of the performance is emphasized by the fact that Congress will have to face the problem again in January. It is estimated that increased pay and retirement benefits for District employees will amount to between \$18.6 and \$24.2 million. This will mean a deficit of \$10 to \$15 million before the end of the fiscal year. The only place that Congress can reasonably turn for funds to meet this deficit will be to the Federal payment which has been authorized but not appropriated. In view of this situation the performance of yesterday was incredibly shortsighted.

APPOINTMENT OF MISS MARIAN ANDERSON AS AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I was unable to be in the Chamber 2 days ago when the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the other Senators commented with great pleasure on the appointment of Miss Marian Anderson as an alternate representative of the United

States to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Miss Anderson is a resident of Philadelphia. She is one of our leading citizens, one of whom we are extremely proud. Her public career has been a credit to her home city.

She is, I think, the only living citizen of Philadelphia for whom one of our fine new swimming pools, built under a recreational program with which, I am pleased to say, I had something to do while I was mayor, has been named. Miss Anderson dedicated that swimming pool. We were more than happy to have her do so.

Miss Anderson has been one of our great Philadelphians. I join with my colleagues in expressing my gratification that the President has seen fit to honor her with this appointment. I am certain she will be a most effective representative of the United States of America.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have been gravely concerned about the attitude of the State Department in getting ready for the forthcoming, inevitable summit conference. I have read this morning a transcript of the news conference of the Secretary of State. I have also read the latest in the series of letters from the President to Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. President, I am gravely disturbed by the public statements of Mr. Dulles in his press conference that the Department of State is not prepared either to go ahead with disarmament negotiations or, indeed, to attend a serious summit conference on the Middle East. Why is not the State Department so prepared? We all know that there are many able persons in the Department who are well qualified to prepare the necessary papers and agenda for such a conference.

If they are not prepared, why has the Secretary of State publicly announced that he is about to take off for South America for a conference, no doubt of some importance, with nations in Latin America? At a time when it would seem to me that the Department is not prepared, should he not stay home and prepare the impending conference on the situation which threatens us in the Middle East.

In this connection, I regret very much that the Department of State seems to be taking a position, with the acquiescence of the President, that the United States is not in favor of private meetings to try to solve the problems which divide Russia and ourselves, at the time the Security Council meeting takes place in New York or elsewhere.

I point out to my colleagues and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that, from my point of view, Mr. De Gaulle, of France, has taken a far more realistic position in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his reply to the latest letter from Mr. Khrushchev be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message of General De Gaulle was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 1, 1958]

TEXT OF REPLY BY DE GAULLE

PARIS, July 31.—Following, in unofficial translation, is the text of Gen. Charles de Gaulle's message to Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, published here tonight:

"Your letter of July 29 insists on the importance and the urgency in your eyes for the meeting of a conference of the heads of the Governments of the Soviet Union, of the United States of America, of Great Britain, of France, and of India, to study the problems of the Middle East.

"You envisage that such a conference be held in Europe. You indicate that it should have as its object 'to insure the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan and to prevent the extension of the military conflict.'

"As regards the principle of a meeting of heads of government, I confirm to you the acceptance of the French Government as soon as such a meeting would take place in the necessary conditions of objectivity and serenity.

"If the other governments concerned were agreed that such a conference be held and if they could do it in these conditions, I would be ready to go to any city of Europe and at any date that would be convenient to the participants.

"I would propose for my part that it would be Geneva on August 18 next.

"As regards the object of the conference, I believe that it should not be limited to the problem raised by the presence of United States troops in the Lebanon and British troops in Jordan, which is but by the consequence of a general situation, nor to the possible extension of the zone of military conflict, because one sees no conflict of this sort.

"It is, in my opinion, the whole Middle East affair and the state of continual crisis that prevents this region of the world from living and developing in normal conditions that the conference would have to tackle in a frank and complete manner.

"After the consultation France is at present conducting with certain other states, she may, if the occasion arises, make precise proposals on these subjects.

"Pending a decision by the governments concerned as regards the project for a summit conference, the French Government makes no objection to the Security Council's holding a new session, as suggested by the British and United States Governments.

"However, such a session, because of the composition of the Council, the number of states that should be invited to participate, the nature of its agenda, and the character of its debates, should not be confused with a conference of heads of government.

"In any case I have the feeling that it would be desirable henceforth to pursue through normal diplomatic channels the discussions that might still be necessary to reach agreement as regards the principle, the place, the date, and the object of the conference which you, yourself, first proposed."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of our keenest and most eloquent commentators in the international field is Mr. James Reston. His column this morning is devoted to the subject about which I am now speaking. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article entitled "Smoke-Filled Rooms," published in the New York Times for today, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOKE-FILLED ROOMS—UNITED STATES FOUND ALONE IN DISLIKING IDEA OF FORMAL-INFORMAL PRIVATE TALKS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—The long debate on the art and wisdom of summitry reached a critical point today—namely, whether there should be a smoke-filled room at the summit when and if the great men get there.

On this question, the United States, which invented the smoke-filled room at the Blackstone Hotel in Chicago during the 1920 Republican convention, said "No." In the sense that Harry Daugherty, Warren G. Harding's campaign manager, meant the phrase—a room where a few political leaders would meet and decide the major political questions—Washington is opposed.

However, Premier Charles de Gaulle, of France, wants precisely this kind of room at the summit, free of the binding regulations of the United Nations. Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, of Britain, appears more interested in arranging private talks, though under the supervision of the United Nations, than he is in the Security Council appearances of the heads of government. And so does Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

If this seems a narrow point to preoccupy great nations, the reader should know that solemn diplomatic notes have been passing back and forth across the Atlantic for days on even narrower points than this.

For example, there has been considerable discussion in the embassies here yesterday and today about what constitutes a smoke-filled-room session.

Does the United States rule out informal talks altogether, or only informal talks that attempt to reach decisions? Would it be all right to meet and just talk in a smoke-filled room? And, finally, would Washington agree to formal-informal talks or insist on informal-informal talks?

THE UNITED STATES POSITION

After 14 personal interviews and 43 telephone calls, this reporter is in a position to define the United States position as follows:

Secretary of State Dulles does not rule out accidental talks between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev if they happen to meet in a United Nations or hotel corridor.

Social gatherings are O. K. if, after dinner in, say, Prime Minister Macmillan's hotel room, Mr. Khrushchev makes some serious observations about the Middle East, the President would listen and might participate in the discussion. This would be an informal-informal talk.

If, however, someone suggested that President Eisenhower, Mr. Khrushchev, General de Gaulle, and Mr. Macmillan should meet every day 2 hours before the formal meeting of the Security Council to discuss ways and means of resolving questions that had risen there, this would be opposed by the United States on the ground that it was a formal-informal meeting and would amount to ganging up on the small nations.

Finally, provided the talks are kept to charges and countercharges concerning military and political action in the Middle East, Moscow's as well as Washington's and London's the United States will debate the issue in public anywhere the Council likes—in New York, Geneva, Paris, or anywhere else—except the Soviet Union.

MOST PECULIAR TO SOME

This, of course, strikes the British, the French, and the Russians as a most peculiar conception of summitry.

The Russians, who really did invent the smoke-filled room before Harry Daugherty made it famous, would like to carve up and parcel out the Middle East in the smallest

room in Geneva. This, essentially, is what Washington says it opposes: Big-power domination of the rest.

General de Gaulle, who has been clearer, more consistent and—what is even more welcome—briefer than the rest, wants honest, informal discussion between the four heads of government, not with the purpose of placing a diktat before the United Nations and the world, but in the hope of working out a fair accommodation of middle eastern problems for that body's consideration.

Prime Minister Macmillan is more subtle. He wants the same thing as General de Gaulle, but the British feel that they could never have persuaded the President to get near the summit unless they involved the move in the United Nations. So they are talking a great deal about the United Nations while actually hoping for precisely those decisions in a smoke-filled room (politely called recommendations) that Secretary Dulles is trying to avoid.

What astonishes the United States allies, and particularly the logical French, is why Washington is so brave about committing the person and prestige of the President of the United States to a public wrangle with Mr. Khrushchev in the Security Council while hesitating about serious talks in private.

Why, they ask, have the heads of government gone to all the trouble of engaging in a public debate about past military action in the Middle East—an exercise that can be carried on with less danger by the permanent delegates at the United Nations—and then shying away from private efforts to reach a just settlement of the root problems that led to that military action?

This, too, is the position taken by Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary General of the United Nations. He is not afraid that the government chiefs will bring any decision out of private talks and try to impose it on the United Nations and the middle eastern powers. He does not believe that talking with Mr. Khrushchev equals capitulating to him.

But he is afraid that a public exchange of charges between the heads of government would inflame world tensions. It is not smoke in New York he fears, but fire in the Middle East.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it occurs to me that Premier de Gaulle and Mr. Reston have clearly set forth reasons why it would be wise for the Department of State and, indeed, the President to reconsider their apparent determination to forestall any serious present effort to ease international tension through private conversations at the highest level.

SENATE PROCEDURE, BY CHARLES L. WATKINS AND FLOYD M. RIDDICK, PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some weeks ago each of us received a handsomely bound volume entitled "Senate Procedure." The authors of this book are Mr. Charles L. Watkins, our experienced and wise Parliamentarian, and Mr. Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian.

Some favorable comment about the book took place in the Senate at the time of its publication. I have delayed my own observations until I have had time to study the contents.

Mr. Watkins and Mr. Riddick are to be congratulated upon the thoroughness, the clarity, and the exhaustive citations which characterize this splendid volume.

As a relatively new Member of the Senate, I can state that my knowledge of the Senate and its traditions, procedures, and rules is certainly the greater today for having studied and read the book entitled "Senate Procedure."

We are fortunate to have on our Senate staff scholars with the energy, ambition, and knowledge to produce an authoritative volume of this caliber.

Each of us, I understand, has received two extra copies of Senate Procedure. I have put mine to the best possible use. I have sent them to the Honorable Boyd Overhulse, of Madras, Oreg., President of the Oregon State Senate, where once I had the honor to serve, and to the Honorable Walter J. Pearson, of Portland, Oreg., who very probably will be elected President of the Oregon State Senate in January of 1959.

These two able State senators undoubtedly will profit as presiding officers through the reading of Senate Procedure in the United States Senate by our skilled and able parliamentarians, Charles L. Watkins and Floyd M. Riddick.

Furthermore, I compliment Mr. Watkins and Mr. Riddick upon the outstanding quality of the writing in their book. If the purpose of words is to convey meaning—as I believe it is—these two men have skillfully avoided ambiguities and vagueness, and have made abundantly clear the information which they seek to disseminate. In addition, the book is well printed by our Government Printing Office and is tastefully bound in dignified black leather. I hope that some of our national periodicals like the New York Times Book Review and the Saturday Review will accord this book the distinction it merits, and that it will be reviewed in their columns.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. BETTS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the bill (S. 3651) to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and for other purposes, vice Mr. KILBURN excused.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2239) for the relief of Wadiha Salime Hamade, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. CHELF, and Mr. HYDE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 7898. An act to revise the authorization with respect to the charging of tolls on the bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; and

H. R. 10805. An act for the relief of certain persons who sustained damages by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13549) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 495. An act to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 3778. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2767. An act to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records;

H. R. 8826. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office;

H. R. 9196. An act to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10805. An act for the relief of certain persons who sustained damages by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods;

H. R. 11805. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 12140. An act to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12850. An act to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13138. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, to provide for more effective integration of a fish and wildlife conservation program with Federal water-resource developments, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 13549) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

BACKGROUND TO THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE: REMEMBER THE RECORD OF APPEASEMENT OF THE 1930'S; REMEMBER THE RECORD OF SOVIET TREATY VIOLATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day, when speaking on the floor of the Senate, I cautioned the people of the United States, and of the world, not to permit themselves to be lulled to sleep by the mistaken notion that a summit conference with the Soviet Union will miraculously solve world problems.

I pointed out that, first, in the past, there have been many summit conferences with Soviet Russia; second, virtually every agreement reached at those summit conferences was subsequently violated by the Soviet Union.

Do we have any reason, therefore, to expect that, this time, the postsummit results will be any different?

I am not arguing against holding a summit conference, as such.

On the contrary, I believe that (a) if there are proper procedural safeguards, such as President Eisenhower has outlined, and (b) if the Free World is truly awake to the dangers, then the hazards of a summit conference can be minimized.

THE PRESIDENT'S LATEST LETTER CONFIRMS UNITED STATES SINCERITY ON SUMMIT

President Eisenhower's latest letter to Khrushchev is a masterpiece of straightforward, specific, clear-cut comment. The President debunks the Soviet charge that we are allegedly dragging our feet, so far as holding the summit conference is concerned.

The President affirmatively outlines, in an absolute, open and aboveboard way, his personal intention to participate, his invitation for Khrushchev to participate, and the need for clear-cut conditions for the conference.

The letter confirms what the President has so frequently stated, namely, that the United States will sincerely leave no stone unturned in seeking a sound basis for possible East-West settlement. But the President's model of forthrightness does not in any way alter the fact that the President knows, as all should know, that the past record of postsummit results has been studded with Soviet violations.

ALLIES FOOLING THEMSELVES ABOUT DIPLOMATIC MIRACLES

Unfortunately, many of our allies have ignored that past record. Some of our allies seem to have taken, in effect, tranquilizer pills. They have been putting themselves half to sleep. They have been singing to themselves a Soviet peace lullaby, as if a summit conference were going to settle the cold war. Unfortunately, it probably will result in no such thing. It may be a propaganda circus, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, unless strictest procedures are followed. Even then, the Soviet Union may utterly abuse the world's earnest desire for a real diplomatic parley.

President Eisenhower has been right, therefore, in cautioning the world against overconfidence in the results of the summit conference.

SOVIET RECORD OF 1,000 TREATY VIOLATIONS

I personally invite my colleagues' attention to Senate Document No. 125,

entitled "Soviet Political Agreements and Results." This document, 63 pages long, was published in 1956 by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. It contained a list of 1,000 or so Soviet bilateral and multilateral agreements signed with the other nations of the world. A staff analysis of all of those agreements shows that in the short years since the Soviet Union came into existence in 1917, "its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it had ever given a signed promise."

I ask our allies: Are we, then, gullibly to collect more worthless Soviet signatures at the summit? Are we, then, to fool ourselves into believing that Mr. Khrushchev is suddenly going to change his Government's habits?

SPECIFIC RED VIOLATIONS

Are we to fail to remember that Mr. Khrushchev has the same attitude that Kaiser Wilhelm I had; namely, that "a treaty is but a scrap of paper"?

What treaties has Russia violated?

First. Analysis has shown that she has violated 50 of her 52 major agreements with us.

Second. The Senate Judiciary Committee study listed, as I have indicated, 1,000 treaties and agreements signed by Russia, virtually every one of which was broken.

When Russia invaded Finland, she violated the League of Nations Covenant. Russia violated the Kellogg-Briand Pact. She violated the United Nations Charter. She adhered to the Atlantic Charter; then violated it. She violated the Potsdam Agreement. She violated the Cairo Agreement. She violated the Tehran Agreement. She violated the Geneva Agreement.

NEED FOR IRONCLAD INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

Is it any wonder, therefore, that we have insisted time and again that it is useless to sign an agreement with Russia unless there is an ironclad step-by-step inspection system or enforcement system?

Is it any wonder that we have tried to warn the other peoples of the world not to "build themselves up" once more to an "awful letdown"?

CAIRO MAY BE TRYING TO IMITATE STALIN-HITLER RECORD

The fact is, Mr. President, that the Soviet record of treaty violations, while a source of disgust to us, has become, perhaps, a model example for some other unscrupulous powers.

I wonder to what extent the powers that be in Cairo think they can duplicate the Soviet record? I wonder how far they think they can go in trying to get away with treaty violations and falsification? Does Cairo think it can imitate the successful record of Adolf Hitler from 1933 to 1939?

What was that record?

It was a record of, first, one treaty violation after another; second, one demand for appeasement after another; and, third, one pledge after another that if appeased just once more there would be no more demands.

Today, step by step, Cairo seems to be making demands upon the world—

always apparently promising to act in good faith if its one more request is respected.

APPEASEMENT OF CAIRO WILL NOT WORK

Mr. President, I say that appeasement of Cairo will not work in 1958 any more than appeasement of Adolf Hitler worked in the 1930's.

I say that an aggressor who tries to win unjust spoils becomes bigger and stronger, step by step, after each uncontested violation. An aggressor plays on the gullibility of others, upon their desire for peace and stability. He strings them along, always luring them deeper and deeper into his trap.

I send to the desk a brief summary of how Hitler and his cohort, Mussolini, played this step-by-step game of stringing along their foes in the 1930's. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE RECORD OF THE 1930'S: STEP-BY-STEP VIOLATION AND APPEASEMENT

January 30, 1933: Hitler scrapped the Versailles Treaty by rearming immediately after coming into power.

October 3, 1935: Mussolini violated the League of Nations Charter and invaded Ethiopia.

March 7, 1936: Hitler violated the Locarno Pact by remilitarizing the Rhineland.

July 18, 1936: Hitler and Mussolini violated nonintervention agreements by intervening in the Spanish Civil War.

March 11, 1938: Hitler violated Austrian sovereignty by invading Austria.

September 30, 1938: Hitler violated Czechoslovakian sovereignty by obtaining the Sudetenland at Munich.

March 15, 1939: Hitler violated the Munich Agreement by invading Czechoslovakia.

April 7, 1939: Mussolini violated Albania's sovereignty by invading Albania.

September 1, 1939: Hitler violated Polish sovereignty by invading Poland.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I was asked, "Senator, why do you make these remarks?"

Mr. President, I make them because of the situation which exists at this time. Only this morning, I heard—over the television—reports to the effect that people of practically all countries are, because of their deep hunger and desire for peace, virtually forcing their leaders to the summit, and are expecting that by means of such a meeting, the millennium—peace—will arrive.

But, Mr. President, as I have stated, at the same time, in my humble opinion, those who expect such a result are but building themselves up for a letdown.

A mental letdown is bad enough; but if other peoples begin to believe that peace is just around the corner, that will be exactly what the Kremlin wants, for the leaders in the Kremlin want the people of other countries to fall asleep—as the people of the United States did at the time of Pearl Harbor, and as the people of England did at the time when Chamberlain returned from Munich and said "I have gotten peace in our time."

Mr. President, that must not occur again.

So, to the people of this land, I say that I trust they will carefully consider what

I have said. My message to them is: Awake, America, awake. Beware of taking pills that would put you to sleep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4208) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for construction, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make in connection with the bill.

Senate bill 4208 represents the first piece of proposed legislation to come before the Senate which is required by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. The purpose of the bill is to authorize capital expenditures in the amount of \$47,800,000 for the new space agency during the fiscal year 1959.

The committee heard in detail from Dr. Dryden, the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, who testified in support of the requests for the authorizations contained in the bill; and the committee then ordered it reported, without objection. The Appropriations Committee has similarly heard, from representatives of the executive branch, testimony in favor of appropriations to carry out the purposes of the bill.

In brief, Senate bill 4208 authorizes appropriations of \$24,500,000 for expansion of the existing facility at Wallops Island, Va., where the launching of small rockets now takes place. The bill also authorizes appropriations of \$3,750,000 for a space project center in the vicinity of Washington, D. C., and appropriations of \$19,550,000 for equipment and instrumentation at various locations and installations now operated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which soon will become a part of the new Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Congress has acted with both speed and great care in setting up the executive and legislative organizations for dealing with the space age. All of us are familiar with the civilian and military benefits which can flow from a vigorous space program.

The capital expenditure requests made by the executive branch, and dealt with in this bill will contribute to our efforts to accelerate civilian experimentation and exploration in space technology; and it is with strong convictions that the committee urges favorable action by the Senate on the bill, so we may proceed without any delay with our space program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4208) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of \$47,800,000 for acquisition or condemnation of real property, for plant and facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other items of a capital nature as follows:

Pilotless aircraft station, Wallops Island, Va.: Additional launching facilities; range control and administration building; shop and laboratory facilities; roads, causeway, bridges, seawall, and appurtenances; utilities; equipment and instrumentation; and approximately 3,400 acres of land, \$24,500,000.

Space projects center, vicinity of Washington, D. C.: Space projects building; research projects laboratory; roads and appurtenances; utilities; equipment and instrumentation, \$3,750,000.

Various locations: Equipment and instrumentation, \$19,550,000.

Sec. 2. Any of the amounts enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed \$47,800,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES STUDY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2077, S. 4021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4021) to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins, and intervening areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 3, line 2, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "9"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "of", to insert "existing Federal"; after line 6, to insert:

(5) to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, irrigation, or multiple purpose projects.

In line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "ten" and insert "eleven"; on page 5, line 6, after the word "States", to insert "except that a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed under this act without prejudice to his retired status, and, he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$12,000 in any one calendar year;"; in line 14, after "(2)", to strike out "Five" and insert "Six"; in line 18, after the name "Agriculture", to insert "one from the Department of Interior"; on page 7, line 6, after the name "President", to strike out "and the Congress"; in line 7, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "9"; in line 18, after the word "necessary", to strike out "transmit in the mails, free of postage, under cover of a penalty envelope, matters which relate exclusively to the business of the Commission" and insert "use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as Departments and agencies of the United States Government"; on page 8, line 10, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed"; in line 19, after the word "travel", to insert "in accordance with standardized Government Travel Regulations"; at the top of page 9, to insert:

Sec. 5. Responsibility shall be vested in the Chairman for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission, (2) the distribution of business among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds: *Provided*, That in carrying out his functions under the provisions of this section, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission.

At the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; on page 10, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "6" to "7"; in line 16, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; in line 22, after the word "are", to strike out "directed" and insert "authorized"; on page 11, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "and estimates of contributions that may be required from power revenues to return reimbursable costs of present and prospective projects that are beyond the ability of water users, or drainage beneficiaries to pay;"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 20, after "Stat.", to strike out "887"; and insert "887."; after line 20, to strike out:

(3) Proposals for the acquisition of a right to the use of water and the regulation of its appropriation and distribution for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes shall be in conformity with applicable State laws;

(4) Any such plan shall recognize and give full effect to existing interstate compacts relating to the land and water resources of the basins referred to in this act;

(5) Federal projects now constructed and in operation, or under construction, or authorized for construction, or which may be authorized substantially in accordance with reports currently before Congress, if in compliance with the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction

of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 837), shall not be altered, changed, restricted or otherwise impeded or interfered with by reason of this act.

On page 13, at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "8" to "9"; in line 16, after the name "President", to strike out "and the Congress"; in line 18, after the name "President", to strike out "and the Congress"; on page 14, after line 7, to strike out:

(b) If, within 2 years from the date of its organization, the Commission, after complying with subsection (a) of this section, shall have been unable to agree unanimously upon and to submit to the President and to the Congress a plan as hereinbefore provided, then the Commission shall, within 6 months thereafter, submit to the President and to the Congress (1) such plan as shall have received the favorable vote of a majority of the members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act; or (2) in the event plan receiving the favorable vote of a majority of such members referred to in clause (1) of this subsection does not receive the favorable vote of a majority of the whole Commission, then the Commission shall submit vote (A) such plan as shall have received the favorable vote of a majority of such members referred to in clause (1) of this subsection, and (B) such plan, if any, as shall have received the favorable vote of a majority of the members of the whole Commission.

At the top of page 15, to insert:

(c) The President shall, within 90 days after the receipt by him of the final report of the Commission, transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

At the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; and, after line 6, to strike out:

SEC. 9. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is—

(a) to provide for an integrated and co-operative investigation, study, and survey by a commission created pursuant to this act and composed of representatives of certain departments and agencies of the United States, and of certain States enumerated in this section, in connection with, and in promotion of, the conservation, utilization, and development of the land and water resources of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas) in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama in order to formulate a comprehensive and coordinated plan for—

- (1) flood control and prevention;
- (2) domestic and municipal water supplies;
- (3) the improvement and safeguarding of navigation;
- (4) the reclamation and irrigation of land, including drainage;
- (5) possibilities of hydroelectric power and industrial development and utilization;
- (6) soil conservation and utilization;
- (7) forest conservation and utilization;

- (8) preservation, protection, and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources;
- (9) the development of recreation;
- (10) salinity and sediment control;
- (11) pollution abatement and the protection of public health; and
- (12) such other beneficial and useful purposes not herein enumerated; and

(b) to formulate, within the time provided for in section 9 of this act, a basic, comprehensive and integrated plan of development of the land and water resources within the area described in this section for submission to, and consideration by, the President and the Congress, and to make recommendations, after adequate study, for executing and keeping current such plan. It is not the purpose of this act to create any continuing or permanent instrumentality of the Federal Government or to take from, or reassign, the duties and powers of any department or agency of the United States represented on the Commission, except as herein provided in this act.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this act it shall be the policy of Congress to—

(1) recognize and protect the rights and interests of the States in determining the development of the watersheds of the rivers herein mentioned and their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as well as the preservation and protection of established uses;

(2) protect existing and authorized projects and projects under construction whether public or private;

(3) utilize the services, studies, surveys, and continuing investigational programs of the departments, bureaus, and agencies of the United States;

(4) recognize an important body of existing Federal law affecting the public lands, irrigation, reclamation, flood control, grazings, geological survey, national parks, mines, and minerals; and

(5) to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, irrigation, or multiple purpose projects.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins and intervening areas hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 11 members appointed by the President as follows:

(1) One member, who shall serve as Chairman, and who shall be a resident from the area comprising the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas) embraced within the States referred to in the first section of this act and who shall not, during the period of his service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except that a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed under this act without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$12,000 in any one calendar year;

(2) Six members, of whom one shall be from the Department of the Army, one from the Department of Commerce, one from the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one from the Department of Agriculture, one from the Department of Interior, and one from the Federal Power Commission; and

(3) Four members, upon the recommendation and nomination, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, of the respective governors of each of the following States: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

(c) In the event of the failure of the governor of any of the States referred to in subsection (b) of this section to recommend and nominate a person or persons in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section satisfactory to the President within 60 days after a request by the President for such recommendation and nomination, the President shall then select and appoint a qualified resident from such State which failed to submit a satisfactory recommendation and nomination.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Within 30 days after the appointment of the members of the Commission by the President, and funds have been made available by the Congress as provided for in this act, the Commission shall organize for the performance of its functions.

(f) The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Six members of the Commission, of whom at least three shall have been appointed pursuant to subsection (b) (3) or (c) of this section, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(h) Members of the Commission shall report from time to time to their respective departments or agencies, or to their respective governors if appointed pursuant to subsection (b) (3) or (c) of this section, on the work of the Commission, and any comments and suggestions pertaining to such work from such departments, agencies, or governors shall be placed before the Commission for its consideration.

(i) The Commission shall cease to exist within 3 months from the date of its submission to the President of its final report as provided for in section 9 of this act. All property, assets, and records of the Commission shall thereupon be turned over for liquidation and disposition to such agency or agencies in the executive branch as the President shall designate.

SEC. 4. The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, administer such oaths, and publish so much of its proceedings and the reports thereon as it may deem advisable; lease, furnish, and equip such office space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as it may deem necessary; use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States Government; have printing and binding done in its discretion by establishments other than the Government Printing Office; employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; purchase or hire, operate, maintain, and dispose of such vehicles as it may require; secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commis-

sion, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, and employees of the departments or agencies from which persons have been appointed to the Commission pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act may be assigned upon request by the Chairman of the Commission to temporary duty with the Commission without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status; pay travel in accordance with standardized Government Travel Regulations and other necessary expenses incurred by it, or any of its officers or employees, in the performance of duties vested in such Commission; and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform the functions vested in such Commission under this act.

Sec. 5. Responsibility shall be vested in the Chairman for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission, (2) the distribution of business among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds: *Provided*, That in carrying out his functions under the provisions of this section, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission.

Sec. 6. (a) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Such members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act, shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per day when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties, but the aggregate compensation received by the members of the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed \$12,000 per annum in the case of the Chairman, and \$7,500 per annum in the case of members of the Commission other than those members appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act.

Sec. 7. In the formulation of a comprehensive and coordinated plan or plans for (a) the control, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas), (b) conservation and development of the land resources of such area; (c) flood control, navigation, reclamation, agriculture purposes, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and (d) such other needs as are set forth in paragraph (a) of the first section of this act, the Commission shall—

(1) seek to secure maximum public benefits for the region and the Nation consistent with the specific directions contained in section 8 and elsewhere in this act;

(2) utilize the services, studies, surveys, and reports of existing Government agencies and shall encourage the completion of such current and additional studies and investigations by such agencies as will further the purposes of this act, and such agencies are authorized to cooperate within the limits of available funds and personnel to the end that the Commission may carry out its functions as expeditiously as possible;

(3) take into consideration the financial, physical, and economic benefits of existing and prospective Federal works constructed or to be constructed consistent with the purposes of this act;

(4) include in its plan or plans estimated costs and benefits; recommendations relating to the establishment of pay-out schedules (areawide or otherwise) taking into account the Federal Government's present and prospective investment in the area; costs reimbursable and nonreimbursable; sources for reimbursement; returns heretofore made from existing projects and estimates of returns from recommended projects; repayment schedules for water, irrigation, industrial, and other uses; power rates and recommendations for the marketing thereof in such manner as to encourage its most widespread use at the lowest possible rates consistent with the return of capital investment and interest thereon;

(5) offer in its plan or plans proposals for the construction and operation of the projects contained therein, and designate the functions and activities of the various Federal departments and agencies in connection therewith consistent with existing law, except that no such plan or plans shall include final project designs and estimates.

Sec. 8. In the formulation of its plan or plans and in the preparation of its report to the President and to the Congress, the Commission shall comply with the following directives:

(1) The report shall contain the basic comprehensive plan for the development of the water and land resources of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas) formulated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of, and to accomplish the purposes of, this act;

(2) The Commission and the participating Federal departments and agencies shall comply substantially with the intent, purposes, and procedure set forth in the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

Sec. 9. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to prepare a final report, within the time provided for in this section, for submission to the President. Before the Commission takes final action on the approval of such report for submission to the President, it shall transmit a copy of such report to each department, agency, and governor referred to in subsection (b) of section 3 of this act. Within 90 days from the date of receipt by each such department, agency, and governor of such proposed report, the written views, comments, and recommendations of such department, agency, and governor shall be submitted to the Commission. The Commission may adopt in its report to the President and to the Congress any views, comments, and recommendations so submitted and change its report accordingly. The Commission shall transmit to the President, with its final report, the submitted views, comments, and recommendations of each such department, agency, and governor whether or not adopted by such Commission.

(c) The President shall, within 90 days after the receipt by him of the final report of the Commission, transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

(d) The final report of the Commission and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

Sec. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the establishment of a United States Study Commission which would be responsible for the preparation of integrated and cooperative investigations, studies, and surveys of land and water resources in the southeastern portion of

the country. The area encompassed for the study includes that portion of the southeast drainage basins which would be bounded on the northeast by the Savannah River Basin, on the south by the St. Marys-Nassau River Basin and on the west by the Alabama-Coosa River Basin system.

The Study Commission would be empowered to prepare plans for development of land and water resources of the area and to submit a report on such plans to the President. The Study Commission would be composed of 11 members who would be appointed by the President; 6 members would be from Federal departments; 4 members from the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. The Chairman, who would be the 11th member, would be a resident of one of the States embraced within the study area.

The Commission would cease to exist within 3 months from the date of its submission of its final report to the President and the President shall, within 90 days after receipt of the final report transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4021) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1850, S. 552.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 552) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the measure is before the Senate at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He has discussed it with the leadership on both sides several times. We have agreed to schedule the bill for prompt action. It seems the most convenient time to do it is now.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J., as to the liability of the United States, if any, either legal or equitable, for losses alleged to have been sustained by the claimant as the result of the performance of a contract numbered VAc-1185, dated July 25, 1941, entered into with the Veterans' Administration.

The proposed legislation provides that, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and that proceedings for the determination of the claim and review of it, and payment of any judgment, shall be had as in the case of claims over which the court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code—claims against the United States generally.

The proposed legislation further provides that nothing contained in it shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

I am informed the bill was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. The senior Senator from New Jersey is very much interested in it. I hope it may be acted upon at this time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 552) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J., as to the liability of the United States, if any, either legal or equitable, for losses alleged to have been sustained by the said Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J., as the result of the performance of a contract No. VAC-1185, dated July 25, 1941, entered into with the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT, 1916

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 3916.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3916) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 14 of the Shipping Act, 1916, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Provided, That nothing in this section or elsewhere in this act, shall be construed or applied to forbid or make unlawful any dual rate contract arrangement in use by the members of a conference on May 19, 1958, which conference is organized under an agreement approved under section 15 of this act by the regulatory body administering this act, unless and until such regu-

latory body disapproves, cancels, or modifies such arrangement in accordance with the standards set forth in section 15 of this act. The term 'dual rate contract arrangement' as used herein means a practice whereby a conference establishes tariffs of rates at two levels the lower of which will be charged to merchants who agree to ship their cargoes on vessels of members of the conference only and the higher of which shall be charged to merchants who do not so agree."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective immediately upon enactment and shall cease to be effective on and after June 30, 1960.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the House amendment, which merely changes the effective date of the bill, and which is agreeable to all members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

This bill, as it passed the Senate, provided that nothing in the Shipping Act of 1916 shall be construed to forbid or make unlawful any dual rate contract arrangement in effect at the time of enactment of the bill by members of a steamship conference organized pursuant to section 15 of the act. The bill is of a temporary nature and would continue in effect only until June 30, 1960, thus providing time for a thorough consideration of the procedures necessary to resolve the dislocation resulting from a Supreme Court decision of May 19, 1958. In that decision the Court declared illegal the dual-rate contract system of the Japan-Atlantic and Gulf freight conference.

The House amended the Senate bill so as to cover only dual-rate contract arrangements in effect on the date of the Supreme Court decision rather than those in effect on the date of enactment of this bill. In other words, any dual-rate contract arrangement entered into between the date of the Court decision and the date of passage of this bill would not be affected by this legislation, but would be subject to the Court decision.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1669, S. 3493.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3493) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPENSATION TO CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS FOR CERTAIN CEDED LANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will oblige me, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2116, H. R. 11722.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11722) to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 20, line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "act:" and insert "act, together with interest which would have been earned in accordance with law on such revenues had they been deposited in the trust funds of the tribe, as received."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill was reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously. The bill passed the House in the same fashion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relative to the measure under consideration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes.

There is to be hereby authorized to be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds now or hereafter made available to the Bureau of Reclamation and to be placed to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and expended for its benefit and the benefit of its members, pursuant to existing law, a sum of money as provided by the bill. If the payment offered by the Secretary of the Interior for the land to be taken is not accepted within 60 days, the Secretary or the Crow Tribe is authorized to commence in a court of competent jurisdiction an action for determining the just compensation payable for such taking. The fair market value of, and the just compensation payable for, the Indian interest in the lands taken shall not include any value attributable to the construction and development by the United States of the Huntley reclamation project.

The perimeter boundaries of the tract of land which are also the proposed exterior

boundaries of the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, are described in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISPLAY PASTURE FOR BISON HERD ON THE MONTANA NATIONAL BISON RANGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2122, H. R. 3402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3402) to provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the only bison range in the country is in the western part of the State of Nevada. It is a large spread.

This measure, which was introduced by my distinguished colleague in the other body, Representative METCALF, will provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range, so that the herd will be more open to the public and more easily seen. I hope this measure will receive the same unanimous agreement it received in the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3402) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. As I understand the Senate now automatically returns to consideration of the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3493) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enactment clause and insert:

That the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch.

3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition; 68 Stat. 988), is further amended as follows:

Section 3 (c) (8) is amended by adding the following:

"iv. Any employer, at any time, may voluntarily pay into the unemployment compensation fund an amount in excess of the contributions required to be paid under the provisions of this act, and such amount shall be forthwith credited to his reserve account. His rate of contribution shall be computed, or recomputed, as the case may be, with such amount included in the calculation. To affect such employer's rate of contribution for any year, such amount shall be paid not later than 30 days following the mailing of notice of his rate of contribution for such year: *Provided*, That such amount, when paid as aforesaid, shall not be refunded or used as a credit in the payment of contributions in whole or in part."

Sec. 7. Section 7 of said act approved August 28, 1935, is amended—

(a) by striking table A in subsection (b) of said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Table A

"High-quarter wages (col. A)	Basic weekly benefit (col. B)	Minimum qualifying wages (col. C)
\$130.00 to \$184.....	8	276
\$184.01 to \$207.....	9	310
\$207.01 to \$230.....	10	345
\$230.01 to \$253.....	11	379
\$253.01 to \$276.....	12	414
\$276.01 to \$299.....	13	448
\$299.01 to \$322.....	14	483
\$322.01 to \$345.....	15	517
\$345.01 to \$368.....	16	552
\$368.01 to \$391.....	17	586
\$391.01 to \$414.....	18	621
\$414.01 to \$437.....	19	655
\$437.01 to \$460.....	20	690
\$460.01 to \$483.....	21	724
\$483.01 to \$506.....	22	759
\$506.01 to \$529.....	23	793
\$529.01 to \$552.....	24	828
\$552.01 to \$575.....	25	862
\$575.01 to \$598.....	26	897
\$598.01 to \$621.....	27	931
\$621.01 to \$644.....	28	966
\$644.01 to \$667.....	29	1,000
\$667.01 to \$690.....	30	1,035
\$690.01 to \$713.....	31	1,069
\$713.01 to \$736.....	32	1,104
\$736.01 to \$759.....	33	1,138
\$759.01 to \$782.....	34	1,173
\$782.01 to \$805.....	35	1,207
\$805.01 to \$828.....	36	1,242
\$828.01 to \$851.....	37	1,276
\$851.01 to \$874.....	38	1,311
\$874.01 to \$897.....	39	1,345
\$897.01 to \$920.....	40	1,380
\$920.01 to \$943.....	41	1,414
\$943.01 to \$966.....	42	1,449
\$966.01 to \$989.....	43	1,483
\$989.01 to \$1,012.....	44	1,518
\$1,012.01 to \$1,035.....	45	1,552
\$1,035.01 to \$1,058.....	46	1,587
\$1,058.01 to \$1,081.....	47	1,621
\$1,081.01 and over.....	48	1,656

(b) by striking out subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) any otherwise eligible individual shall be entitled during any benefit year to a total amount of benefits equal to 34 times his weekly benefit amount."

(c) striking the figure "\$30" at the end of the first sentence of subsection (f) of section 7 and inserting the figure "\$48" in lieu thereof.

Sec. 3. Section 10 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An individual who has left his most recent work voluntarily without good cause, as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such leaving occurred and with respect to the 6 consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week."

Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) An individual who has been discharged for misconduct occurring in the course of his most recent work proved to the

satisfaction of the Board shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such discharge occurred and for the 6 weeks of consecutive unemployment immediately following such week."

Section 10 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If an individual otherwise eligible for benefits fails, without good cause as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, either to apply for new work found by the Board to be suitable when notified by any employment office, or to accept any suitable work when offered to him by any employment office, his union hiring hall, or any employer direct, he shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such failure occurred and with respect to the 6 consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week. In determining whether or not work is suitable within the meaning of this subsection the Board shall consider (1) the physical fitness and prior training, experience, and earnings of the individual, (2) the distance of the place of work from the individual's place of residence, and (3) the risk involved as to health, safety, or morals."

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the next succeeding calendar quarter following its enactment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate, S. 3493, bears the bill number of the measure which I introduced on March 14, 1958, but, in the course of hearings held before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, on April 21, 1958, and during the markup of the bill in executive session, modifications were made. I concurred in the modifications. Among the modifications made was the addition of the first section of the bill as it now reads.

This section, which is a decided improvement in the law from the standpoint of the employer, safeguards the experience rating of employers who, under it, will be permitted to make voluntary payments into the fund in order to avert a percentage raise in their contributions to the fund. In passing, I might add, this feature of the bill received the endorsement of the Washington Board of Trade in testimony before the committee—pages 51 and 96 of the printed hearings—and it also is contained in a measure introduced in the other body by Representative McMILLAN, H. R. 10625.

Section 2 of the bill, as reported, accomplishes two main purposes: First, it raises the number of weeks for which an eligible unemployed benefit claimant may receive payment from the present 26-week maximum to a 34-week maximum; and, second, it increases the weekly benefit amount from the present maximum of \$30 to \$48 a week.

With regard to the first point, the extension from 26 weeks to 34 weeks, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this represents less than what was adopted earlier in the session under the provisions of H. R. 12065, which became Public Law 85-441. In that act, benefits can now be claimed for 39 weeks by those who are covered by its provisions. The net effect of adoption and enactment of the pending measure will be to limit the District in being able to borrow for payments to eligible claimants to 5 weeks,

the difference between the 39-week limitation of Public Law 85-441 and the 34-week limitation contained in this bill.

I might also point out, Mr. President, that the recommendation of the Rockefeller report, contained in Special Studies Report IV, pages 12 and 13, is:

This panel has endorsed above the temporary supplement to unemployment insurance benefits. At the same time we recommend the following permanent improvements:

(3) The lengthening of the maximum duration of benefits to something like 39 weeks.

It is appreciated that there may be those who, in all sincerity, view with great caution the extension of benefits for the full 39-week period. I personally believe that they are exercised over a scarecrow argument which will be found to have little substance in the actual operation of the program. Since I am convinced that eventually these men, with whom I have an honest difference on this point, will come to accept the full 39-week duration as desirable, I am willing at this session to accept the 34-week provision. I hasten to add, Mr. President, that in reporting this bill to the Senate, a majority of the committee, including members on both sides of the aisle, agreed upon this uniform 34-week extension.

In a similar manner, through negotiation in committee, the maximum benefit figure of \$48 was arrived at as a basis which could command bipartisan support on the floor of the Senate. In this connection, and in further justification of the \$48 a week benefit figure, I should like to invite to the attention of the Senate pages 6 and 7 of the report which accompanied the bill to the floor. The report sets forth the historic formula used in computing the benefit amount at the inception of the unemployment compensation program in 1938. It was then three-fifths of the weekly wage; \$48 a week now for non-Federal workers meets that test. It should also be pointed out that the maximum benefit is not received by every claimant. In order to receive the \$48 amount, the eligible claimant must have received an average weekly wage of \$80 or more in his 13-week high-quarter period and have earned in the preceding benefit year at least \$1,656. The \$48-a-week figure will also meet the recommendations of the Rockefeller report, to which I have previously alluded. That document, on page 14, states under recommendations:

(2) The increase of insurance benefits to cushion more adequately the loss of wages during unemployment and provide purchasing power to counteract recession.

At the time the bill was before us in committee, the Federal pay raise of 10 percent had not yet been enacted. Since its enactment, we can be sure that the average wage in the District of all workers has risen from the \$91 to \$92 weekly figure by an additional \$5 or \$6. The \$48 week average figure of this bill will, therefore, come within the recommendations of the President with regard to unemployment compensation. In this connection, I refer the Senate to page 148 of the printed hearings, which contains a

quotation from a letter sent by the then Secretary of Labor to all State governors under date of November 27, 1954. This reads:

You will recall the goals suggested by the President for improvement of the benefit provisions of the unemployment-insurance laws. He suggested that the States raise their dollar maximums so that the payments to the great majority of beneficiaries may equal at least half their regular earnings. In order to achieve this goal, it is our belief that the maximum benefit level, which is the principal limiting factor on weekly benefits, should be geared to the average gross earnings of all workers covered by the program, not just of those who are drawing benefits at any particular time. Weekly benefit amounts beneath this maximum should be at least 50 percent of the workers' gross earnings in covered employment.

I come now, Mr. President, to the final point on this measure, the section 3 amendments which deal with replacing the present variable disqualification provisions by a uniform 6-week disqualification. These three changes in section 10 of the present law were contained in the original bill which I introduced, and they were also a part of the bill introduced by the ranking Republican on the committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. A full discussion of these changes will be found on pages 12 and 13 of the report on the bill. The changes recommended by the committee are endorsed by the Department of Labor, and in this connection I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the portion of the Secretary of Labor's letter of April 2, 1957, which dealt with these provisions. He said in the communication:

Present disqualification provisions are excessively stringent for inclusion in a sound unemployment-insurance program. An individual who voluntarily quits work, is discharged by reason of misconduct, or refuses to accept suitable work, may be disqualified for a period of not less than 4 nor more than 9 weeks, depending upon the discretion of the administrative official handling the claim. I believe that a disqualification should run only for that period during which unemployment can be said to be attributed to his disqualifying act. Studies have shown that in a normal labor market a person actively looking for work will find employment within 6 weeks. Therefore, unemployment continuing for more than 6 weeks cannot fairly be said to have any relation to any previous acts of the worker. S. 1214 would provide a uniform 6-week disqualification period.

The present law in effect imposes a second penalty based on the same act which postpones qualification for benefits. This is in the form of a reduction in total benefits payable in any one year equal to the number of weeks of disqualification multiplied by the weekly benefit amount. I believe that this second penalty is inequitable and that the 6-week disqualification period discussed above is all that is necessary to discourage those who might otherwise be tempted to take advantage of the unemployment insurance system.

Mr. President, in concluding my opening statement on S. 3493, I urge that the Senate pass this proposed legislation. It is not new legislation or theoretical legislation. Rather, in the best sense of the word, it is conservative legislation. It seeks to conserve, through renovation, sound principles of unemployment compensation, adopted over two decades ago,

which are part of the American tradition in social legislation.

By increasing the amount of benefits, we are but returning to the proportion of the weekly wage that the benefit once represented. By increasing the duration of benefits by 8 weeks, we are but assuring that the mass purchasing power upon which our total economy is based shall be preserved, in part, for the time necessary to permit remedial action to be taken in the event that widespread unemployment should occur, and to carry through the families who need assistance until employment is regained. The uniform disqualification provisions are but the correction of an existing inequity which, when enacted, will remove from arbitrary and subjective administrative discretion application of penalties, thus replacing administrative uncertainty with law, precise and definite.

I thank the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. CLARK] for the great assistance he was to me, as chairman of the subcommittee, in connection with devising an agreed program within our committee which I could bring to the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I thank the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], for the great assistance he was in obtaining within the committee agreement which permitted us to bring this substantial majority report to the Senate.

I also wish to thank the ranking Republican member of the committee [Mr. BEALL] for the great assistance he was to me as chairman of the subcommittee.

This is a fair, reasonable, and needed bill, and I hope the Senate will pass it forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS—ENDORSEMENT OF POSITION OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD two letters, one dated July 19, 1958, and the other dated July 22, 1958, accompanied by certain resolutions which were adopted at the annual conference of the Committee on World Peace of the Methodist Church in my State, in support of the position which I have taken in opposition to the administration's policy in sending marines to the Middle East.

There being no objection, the letters and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., July 19, 1958.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With thousands of fellow Oregonians, I want to thank you for your usual forthright stand in regard to the Middle East crisis. I am sure you have voiced the unexpressed convictions of the people not only of the State but of the Nation in opposing the sending of troops to Lebanon. The TV commentators on the spot and in Washington and New York seem to reflect the same feeling in somewhat guarded language.

As I reported to you last August 7 (thank you for the fine dinner), I was able to observe something of Arab nationalism first hand last July, when I traveled through Egypt and Jordan as well as Israel. I fear that the landing of the marines and paratroopers will only increase Arab resentment against the United States (even on the part of those who wanted American help and protection, as a CBS commentator in Lebanon said last night) and play into the hands of Nasser and the Soviet Union.

I do realize that the situation has been very difficult and that it has been complicated very gravely by the sending of American Armed Forces. But I do hope that the President and the Secretary of State will be able to devise ways of withdrawing the troops from Lebanon, with or without the loss of face. After all, saving face is a quaint oriental idiosyncrasy we can ill afford to indulge in. If we must, perhaps we can recognize the existence of the token United Nations observation force as a face-saving device to extricate ourselves from this impossible and increasingly embarrassing and dangerous position.

I hope and trust that you will continue to speak with conviction and forthrightness on this issue as you have done on others. We are very proud of the stand you and Congresswoman EITH GREEN and other Democratic representatives have taken on this issue. We depend on you to give continued leadership in the Nation when others seem to be so timid.

Sincerely yours,

HIDEO HASHIMOTO,
Associate Professor of Religion,
Chairman, Committee on World
Peace, Oregon Annual Conference
of the Methodist Church.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
OREGON CONFERENCE
COORDINATING COUNCIL,
Portland, Oreg., July 22, 1958.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wrote to you last Saturday supporting your position on the Middle East crisis. I should like to call your attention to the enclosed resolution of the report of the Committee on World Peace of the Oregon annual Methodist conference.

I want to call your attention particularly to Resolution No. 7 on world economic development and urge you to continue your admirable position in supporting the exten-

sion of trade agreements without weakening the amendments. Please keep up the good fight.

I want to call your attention, also, to the resolution passed by the (national) board of world peace of the Methodist Church meeting last November, "The United States can accomplish more for peace and democracy in the Middle East by sponsoring bold solutions to its economic and social problems through the U. N. than by sending arms to unstable governments."

We hope that the American troops will be withdrawn from Lebanon immediately.

Sincerely yours,

DR. HIDEO HASHIMOTO,
Chairman of World Peace Committee,
Oregon Annual Conference of the
Methodist Church.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE

The role of the church in today's world situation is clear. Its task is to help mankind attain freedom, human rights, justice, adequate living standards, self-government, and the cooperation of all nations for the maintenance of peace.

With the development of increasingly horrible weapons of mass destruction, mankind stands at the threshold of possible extinction. In the face of this situation, Christians everywhere are confronted with a definite challenge.

Motivated and mobilized by the spirit of Christ and challenged by world conditions, Christians are in a strategic position to make the Gospel articulate in world affairs to the end that peace may become real and dynamic (par. 2024, 1956 Discipline).

RESOLUTIONS

1. Disarmament: We urge the United States Government to make persistent efforts to achieve universal disarmament through the United Nations. We further urge our Government to take decisive steps now in the direction of disarmament.

2. We urge discontinuance of nuclear-weapons testing by all nations and recommend instead the further development of atomic energy for peaceful uses.

3. Peacetime conscription: "We affirm the oft-stated position of the general conference that compulsory peacetime military training is contrary to the best American traditions and disregards the Christian hope for security through positive policies." (Annual meeting of the Board of World Peace, November 1957.) We urge the abolition of peacetime conscription.

4. We believe that the United Nations and its agencies should be supported, strengthened, and improved. Moreover, if these facilities are to become most effective, the United Nations, with membership open to all nations, must be given sufficient authority to enact, interpret, and enforce world law against aggression and war. (Discipline, p. 2024, sec. 6.)

5. We believe that the United Nations is weakened by the absence of any government, especially those who wield effective power over great numbers of people. We, therefore, urge the recognition of the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic at the United Nations, provided steps have been taken to fulfill the responsibilities of the Free World, and the United States in particular, for the safety and well-being of refugees from the Chinese Communist dictatorship, especially in Formosa.

6. Political freedom: We believe in self-government, and the participation in political processes by all persons within a nation. (Annual meeting, Board of World Peace.)

7. World economic development: "We believe that the United States should give strong leadership to programs of world economic development. Our technical and capital assistance should be generous and ade-

quate. It should be largely channeled through the United Nations agencies, such as SUNFED, UNICEF, and the Technical Board. It should be linked to a continuation of reciprocal trade agreements and the ratification of the Organization to Trade Cooperations." (Annual meeting, Board of World Peace.)

8. Since the Methodist Church has been a strong supporter of democracy and freedom, and since other nations of the world interested in democracy and freedom have looked to America as an example to study and support, we urge our Congressmen and our State Department to discontinue political and military support of dictatorships.

9. We urge a continuation and expansion of the foreign exchange student program and urge Methodist churches to use the international students in some way to expand our knowledge and friendships of other peoples of the world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from a representative of a group of farmers and neighbors who held a picnic in Oregon recently, and, as the writer of the letter says, changed the picnic into what proved to be a meeting in support of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon with regard to American policies involving the sending of Marines to the Middle East. I ask that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIA, OREG., July 21, 1958.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday, at a picnic farmers and neighbors in this area held here, it was decided to turn the affair into a goodwill picnic and express our appreciation to you for your commonsense stand in Washington on foreign affairs.

We appreciate very much the views you expressed in Congress, when you said it is a mistake for the United States to undertake unilaterally, or even in conjunction with Great Britain to interfere with every development in a world that appears to run counter to some interest of ours. We cannot direct to our own liking by force of arms all the forces of growth and change that are now on the loose in the Middle East, South America, or anywhere else.

After we had enjoyed our picnic repast, we drew up a little resolution on the Mideast crisis, and it was adopted, one and all. A copy is attached.

With the very best wishes from those at the picnic, I sign myself,

Sincerely and respectfully yours,
EMIL HENDRICKSON.

Whereas a United Nations commission and U. N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjöld have indicated that the Government-change in Lebanon was a palace-type revolution; and

Whereas the sending of American marines, planes, and sections of our fleet to that area has alarmed the entire world, so that nations of such diverse political orientation as Japan, West Germany, India, People's Republic of China, and Sweden have criticized us for our unilateral action; and

Whereas this action can benefit no one except the Oil Trust, whose interests are not our interests, as witness the price we pay for gasoline; and at the least this action will hinder and impede the East-West efforts at Geneva to find some way of policing the

proposed nuclear bomb-test ban; and at the worst will set the clock hands of history back to Hiroshima, with disastrous consequences to mankind: Now, therefore, we 53 residents of Clatsop County, assembled at a goodwill picnic on this Sunday, the 20th of July 1958, urge:

Removal from Lebanon of the marines and from office of John Foster Dulles; and of interference in the efforts of peoples in Asia and elsewhere to escape, as we once escaped, the colonial system; and a foreign policy based on a realization that 1958 is not 1898, and on humanity and commonsense.

EMIL HENDRICKSON.

ASTORIA, OREG.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2058, Senate bill 4059, which was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4059) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, in order to change the name of the office established under such plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING—COOPERATION BY AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was pleased yesterday to note that the American Meat Institute issued a press release relating to the passage in the Senate of the legislation known as the humane slaughtering practices legislation. That release was constructive and affirmative.

It appears that the American Meat Institute will seek to cooperate with the purposes of the legislation. It also issued a bulletin to all its members, which indicates the same constructive attitude.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a press statement issued by the American Meat Institute giving its reaction to the successful enactment of humane-slaughter legislation, plus a bulletin from the same organization to its members explaining the bill and commenting on the outcome of the legislative action.

I want the RECORD to show I am pleased at the reaction of the American Meat Institute. While this organization fought most vigorously against this legislation which I sponsored, it is accepting the mandate of Congress in good faith—and declaring its intent of going to work toward carrying out the objectives of the legislation. That is the right spirit. I repeat what I said during the debate—eventually, the entire meat industry will welcome and accept this move as a step forward, rather than repressive legislation.

I am convinced that if my colleagues who voted against this legislation, or

tried to block it, will read the statements to which I have referred they will now realize much of their professed fears were in vain.

Because I welcome the initial reaction of the American Meat Institute to this legislation, I want to voice my assurance that as long as such a cooperative spirit is shown toward making this legislation effective I am convinced the meat industry need not fear new drives for tighter or more restrictive legislation until we have had ample chance to see how this can work out. On the other hand, if there is evidence of deliberate foot dragging or attempts to evade the will of Congress, I am convinced that not even I could stop the demands of friends of humane treatment of animals from coming back to Congress with a new appeal for help.

Again I want to commend the meat industry for its favorable attitude now that it has lost fight to prevent this legislation from getting on the law books.

I ask unanimous consent to have the press release and the bulletin printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release and bulletin were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legislation passed by the United States Senate will place the humane slaughter problems back in the hands of experienced experts where they belong, the American Meat Institute stated today.

"The meatpacking industry has always supported humane slaughter practices and has spent more time, money, and effort and come up with more progressive improvements to solve the difficult problems involved than has any other group," the institute said.

"While proponents of a number of legislative proposals have propagandized for humane slaughter laws, many of which have been well intentioned, without defining what is humane, meatpackers, in cooperation with some humane groups, have worked painstakingly at the job and have developed realistic practices that are now in use."

It is vital, according to the institute, that whatever means are devised that there be no interruption in the fast moving, highly efficient production lines of the industry.

"This is a necessary function that must be performed in order to keep a constant flow of 70 million pounds of meat moving steadily each day throughout the country," the institute explained.

Over 50 percent of the cattle are now being stunned with new and improved methods that meet humane standards the Government undoubtedly will approve, the institute reports. Progress in this field has been rapid since a new instrument was introduced a little over a year ago after a long testing period in plants of some of the companies.

"Meat packers welcome the opportunity to work with the special advisory committee which we understand the Secretary of Agriculture will appoint to help the industry develop and test constantly improving solutions to the problem," the institute said. "Such aid, we hope, may speed up progress in devising methods that will be practical with all classes of livestock in all sizes of plants."

[From American Meat Institute, Bulletin No. 99, of July 30, 1958]

HUMANE SLAUGHTER BILL PASSES SENATE

To the members:

The Senate yesterday passed an amended version of H. R. 8308, the bill to regulate

slaughtering methods of the meat packing industry. The amendments, which deal with effective dates and with ritual slaughtering, introduce into the bill variations between it and the bill passed by the House of Representatives, requiring that the legislation be referred to a conference committee unless the House agrees to the amendments. In any event, it is anticipated that the differences will be adjusted and that the bill will be enacted.

This culminates almost 5 years of effort on the part of the institute to avoid unrealistic and unworkable legislation in this area. While the bill is vague and contradictory, it does not stipulate a mandatory or completely unrealistic set of requirements such as some proposals on the subject have included. It does recognize the necessity for flexibility and places with the Secretary authority to make a determination as to what is and what is not legally humane.

Further, it does not carry criminal penalties such as some of these bills have done. It also provides for study and the application of the rule of reason in the matter of compliance. And it finally leaves with the packer the decision as to whether he will or will not adopt any particular methods, depending on his need or desire to sell livestock products to the Federal Government. It had been clear for some time that legislation on this subject was probably inevitable. The pressures exerted on Congress by humane societies has been tremendous, and the difficulty of getting the problem understood from the packers' standpoint has been a handicap. However, in spite of this, the bill now going to conference is a compromise between the extremes of mandatory slaughtering procedures and no legislation. Proper and reasonable administration could make it workable.

What the industry may expect under this bill is not certain. However, it may be helpful to members to analyze its provisions:

1. It is declared to be the policy of the United States that livestock slaughter and the handling of livestock in connection with slaughter be carried out only by humane methods.

2. Whether or not a particular method is humane may be determined by reference to different sections of the bill.

(a) One method declared to be humane is where "all animals are rendered insensible to pain by a single blow or gunshot or an electric, chemical, or other means that is rapid and effective, before being shackled, hoisted, thrown, cast, or cut."

(b) Another method declared to be humane is "slaughtering in accordance with the ritual requirements of the Jewish faith or any other religious faith that prescribes a method of slaughter whereby the animal suffers loss of consciousness by anemia of the brain caused by the simultaneous and instantaneous severance of the carotid arteries with a sharp instrument." One of the amendments adopted by the Senate would declare handling necessary in connection with ritual slaughtering to be humane.

(c) A third method for determining humane methods of slaughter would be by designation of the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the Senate version of the bill, the Secretary would be required to designate such methods on or before March 1, 1959 (the date in the House bill was June 30, 1958). Additional methods could be designated later by giving notice in the Federal Register.

(d) It should be noted that the Secretary of Agriculture would not be required to limit his certification to those methods which would involve a single blow or gunshot, etc. It was made clear in the Congressional debates that the language specifying a single blow, etc., was intended to set forth specifically the techniques found by Congress to be humane, and at the same

time it was intended that the Secretary of Agriculture would designate other methods found by him to be humane. The bill does not prohibit the shackling of hogs, for example, and if the Secretary, after studying the matter, came to the conclusion that shackling was humane there appears to be nothing in the legislation to prevent him from designating it as acceptable under the public policy set forth. As a practical matter, the Secretary no doubt will be under considerable pressure from the humane organizations and it seems unrealistic to suppose that shackling as usually practiced will be designated as an approved method. However, the Secretary probably has it within his power to do so.

3. After June 30, 1960 (in the House bill the date was December 31, 1959), agencies of the Federal Government would be prohibited from procuring any livestock products from any slaughterer or processor which in any of his plants slaughters or handles livestock by any methods other than those designated as acceptable by the Secretary of Agriculture. This apparently would require packers wishing to sell to the Government to be in compliance in all of their plants on all species of livestock.

4. As aids to enforcement, packers selling to Federal agencies would be required to furnish statements of eligibility, with criminal penalties attaching for false statements. Also the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to provide a suitable means of identifying carcasses of animals passed by Federal inspection and slaughtered by approved methods.

5. During any national emergency declared by the President or Congress, the restrictions on Government procurement could be modified by the President to the extent necessary to meet essential procurement needs.

6. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized and directed to conduct, assist, and foster research on methods of handling and slaughtering livestock. To assist him, he would be authorized to establish an advisory committee consisting of the following members:

(a) An officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, who would be chairman of the committee.

(b) Two representatives of national organizations of slaughterers.

(c) One representative of the trade-union movement engaged in packinghouse work.

(d) One representative of the general public.

(e) Two representatives of livestock growers.

(f) One representative of the poultry industry.

(g) Two representatives of national organizations of the humane movement.

(h) One representative of a national professional veterinary organization.

(i) One person familiar with the requirements of religious faiths with respect to slaughter.

7. In an amendment added by the Senate a complete exemption from the law would be extended to ritual slaughter and the handling or other preparation of livestock for ritual slaughter. This provision appears to be inconsistent with the provisions which declare ritual slaughter to be humane; however, there will be an opportunity for modification by any conference committee which may be appointed.

It may be observed that the Secretary of Agriculture is put in a rather difficult position by this bill. On one hand, he will be under pressure from humane organizations to designate certain methods as humane, or alternatively to designate certain methods as inhumane. On the other hand, he will be expected by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to administer the

law in such a way that the Government's meat supplies will not be cut off.

From the packer's standpoint, it may be noted that the only penalty which can be invoked is disqualification to sell livestock products to the Federal Government. So long as no misstatement is made in certifying eligibility, no criminal penalties will attach because certain slaughtering methods are used or because other slaughtering methods are not used.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE,
HOMER DAVISON, President.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY AND MARCUS BORCHARDT, WASHINGTON CIVIC LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the February 1958 issue of the News of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia. Headed, "Tribute Paid Neely and Borchardt," it mourns the loss of that distinguished Member of the Senate, Matthew M. Neely, who had so long befriended them as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, and of Marcus Borchardt who, as a Washington civic leader, had worked continuously for the good of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments and the well-being of the men who constitute these uniformed forces.

The editorial has an additional, a personal meaning for me, not only because I share in its sentiments, but also because the high regard expressed by Washington's policemen and firemen for Marcus Borchardt reveals a pattern of devoted public service closely parallel to that of his father, the late Maj. Newman Borchardt.

In the early pioneer days of Montana, Major Borchardt was chairman of the first board of commissioners for Custer County, which then comprised almost the entire eastern half of the State's area, and the first postmaster of Miles City, where his home was opened for the town's first religious services. Like father, like son. Both lived lives dedicated to service for their fellow men.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE PAID NEELY, BORCHARDT

Within 5 days last month the Policemen's Association lost 2 of its most ardent supporters and dearest friends. The death of Senator Matthew M. Neely, chairman of the Senate District Committee and "mayor" of Washington, will be a great loss to our association. His death on January 18 will be mourned jointly by law enforcement officers of West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

Five days later, Marcus Borchardt succumbed, a victim of pneumonia. A great civic leader, Mark as he was affectionately called, had more than a personal love and admiration for Washington's police and firemen. As chairman of the Public Protection Committee of the Washington Board of Trade, Mark not only understood with a sympathetic heart the many problems confronting the men in blue, but he worked consistently to find the solutions. Our heartfelt sympathy to their families.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 1, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 495. An act to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; and

S. 3778. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A. M. MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, August 4, 1958, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 1, 1958:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 34: 3: *O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt His name together. Almighty God, Thou art our help in each new day and our hope for every unknown tomorrow.*

We humbly confess that to turn away from Thee is to fall but to abide in Thee is to stand fast forever.

May Thy truth be our shield and Thy presence our strength as we daily seek to walk in the way of Thy wise and holy commandments.

Inspire men and nations everywhere with a greater loyalty and devotion to the ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained for the peace and prosperity of the world.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4640. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to payments from voluntary contributions accounts; and

H. R. 8002. An act to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2519. An act for the relief of Crum McKinnon Building Co., of Billings, Mont.;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific Coast;

S. 4167. An act to authorize the lease of Papago tribal land to the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 607) entitled "An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MORTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WADIHA SALIME HAMADE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2239) for the relief of Wadiha Salime Hamade, with a House amendment thereto, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WALTER, CHELF, and HYDE.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 7866.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill S. 4035.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business in the Senate and missed the rollcall on H. R. 13549 yesterday. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER NEAR JEFFERSON BARRACKS (MO.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7898) to revise the authorization with respect to the charging of tolls on the bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, after line 2, insert:

"Sec. 3. The reconstruction or improvement of the Jefferson Barracks Bridge and construction of the additional bridge and approaches pursuant to section 2 of this act shall be commenced not later than July 1, 1960, and shall be completed within 3 years after such date."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know from the gentleman from Maryland if this has been taken up with the ranking Republican members of the committee.

Mr. FALLON. I assume so. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. It is to extend the amortization date on one toll bridge so that they can build a toll bridge next to it, something that we always report favorably.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the change?

Mr. FALLON. The House bill provided for 1 year to start construction and 3 years to complete. The Senate amendment provided for construction to start not later than July 1, 1960, and to be completed by July 1, 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume this involves a toll bridge.

Mr. FALLON. There is an existing toll bridge there now, and it is necessary for them to build another bridge, due to the extent of the traffic.

Mr. GROSS. That will be a toll bridge?

Mr. FALLON. Both will be toll bridges.

Mr. GROSS. I want to point out that in our part of the country we build toll bridges and do not come to the Federal Government to provide us with free bridges as is the case in this area.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

Alger	Hardy	Moulder, Mo.
Ayers	Hays, Ark.	Poage
Barden	Hillings	Powell
Baring	Hoffman	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Ikard	Prouty
Blitch	Jackson	Radwan
Boggs	James	Robeson, Va.
Bonner	Jenkins	Sadlak
Burdick	Jones, Mo.	St. George
Carnahan	Kearney	Scherer
Celler	Keating	Sheehan
Christopher	Krueger	Shuford
Clark	Landrum	Sleminski
Coudert	Lesinski	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Loser	Talle
Dies	McCarthy	Taylor
Diggs	McIntire	Tollefson
Eberharter	Machrowicz	Tuck
Farbstein	Marshall	Willis
Feighan	Mason	Zelenko
Friedel	Michel	
Gordon	Morris	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution—House Resolution 650—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3497) to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 650 makes in order the consideration of S. 3497, the Community Facilities Act of 1958. The resolution pro-

vides for an open rule, 3 hours of general debate, and provides that the substitute amendment, recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency and now in the bill, will be considered without the intervention of any point of order as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

The bill, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, rewrites title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. It authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administration to extend assistance through community facility and public-works loans to municipalities and other political subdivisions of States without regard to population. The existing program has been limited to communities of 50,000 or less. In order to assure equitable distribution of the loan funds, borrowing in any one State could not exceed 10 percent of the funds provided. The terms of the loans would be raised from 40 to 50 years.

Eligibility would be extended to a wide range of facilities and projects, and these are listed in section 205 (b) of the bill. These include streets, highways, bridges, airports, parks, water, sewage, and so forth. In addition, private, non-profit hospitals and nursing homes, would be made eligible for loans under the bill. Priority would be given projects which the administration determines could not be undertaken without the bill's assistance. Provision is also made that the prevailing wage and overtime requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act will apply to projects financed under the bill.

The formula for computing the maximum interest rate is revised and would work out to a rate to borrowers of 2½ percent. The fund for the loans would be increased to \$2 billion, of which \$400 million would constitute a revolving fund.

Section 203 of the bill provides for the financing of the program through the issuance of notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Committee on Rules voted to report no rule on the bill unless the Banking and Currency Committee would agree to offer an amendment to strike this provision of the bill. Such an amendment will be offered by the committee and thus the bill would become the usual type authorization bill.

Finally, section 3 of the bill increases the total amount authorized to be appropriated for advanced planning by municipalities and political subdivisions by \$50 million.

The Banking and Currency Committee feels that the bill will furnish needed economic stimulus and will also enable communities to build essential and desirable public facilities on liberal terms. It is further believed that the economic impact of the program will take effect within a reasonably short period and will aid in relieving unemployment in areas where construction will take place.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 650.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman suppose that our constituents will be asking anything about what is happening to the public debt?

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to the gentleman, I think they will be, because I definitely remember in 1952 in Chicago, Candidate Eisenhower in a speech that I heard said that both he and former Senator Taft thought the annual budget should not be over \$60 billion. He said, "Our defense could be provided on a budget of that amount." Millions of voters supported the Republican candidates on the basis of that statement.

Mr. GROSS. This will be a contribution to that debt, will it not?

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry to say that back in 1952 millions of people were misled by the budget statements in that campaign.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in my opinion, the greatest authority on finances and taxation in the Congress of the United States, recently said:

The present Congress is one of the most reckless spending Congresses I have seen during my 25 years in Washington.

This Congress—

The able Senator stated—

has piled spending on top of what now seems to be a rising economy and has planted the seeds of what could be terrific inflation.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of an extremely able gentleman. Senator BYRD could have gone further and said that the Congress of the United States controls the purse strings, that the executive department of our Government cannot spend one single dime unless this Democratic-controlled Congress gives authority. I believe this present Democratic-controlled Congress is not holding the purse strings as tight as they should be held. For instance, we are going to have to consider here very shortly a bill to raise the national debt from \$280 billion to \$288 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the record will show that in the past the worst spenders in this Congress have been the ones who always voted against raising the debt ceiling. It appears to me from such practice that there is no financial responsibility on the part of those who are always first to come forward with spending legislation and yet will not provide the necessary funds in order to take care of the obligations of the United States, obligations which must be met whether it is in the form of Defense Department contracts or for any other project that has been authorized.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Was the gentleman from Illinois in the Chamber a few weeks ago when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House stood in the well down there and pointed his fingers

at Members in this Chamber and said: "When you go back home and people talk to you about the soaring debt of this country, do not pass the buck because you"—pointing to us—"are responsible."

Is it not the responsibility of this House to curtail spending?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his statement. He is absolutely correct. The majority of the American people realize that the executive department cannot spend a dime without authority from this Congress. The increase in the fiscal budget is a responsibility of this Democratic-controlled Congress.

In the 80th and 83d Republican Congresses we passed a tax reduction of over \$7 billion each session and at the same time we paid off \$8 billion of our national debt. Those two Republican Congresses assumed the responsibility of putting the fiscal policy of our Government in good shape. The American people, I know, realize that.

Mr. Speaker, getting down to this pending resolution, I expect to ask for a rollcall vote on the rule, which provides 3 hours of debate.

As you know, on April 16 the Senate passed this community facilities bill for a billion dollars, but our Committee on Banking and Currency, not to be outdone, doubled it. They bring in one for \$2 billion. The Senate, I think, provided for a 3½ percent interest rate, but the Committee on Banking and Currency, not to be outdone, did not take the 3½ percent rate; they reduced it, to make it more attractive, to 2½ percent.

This covers loans for 50 years. I am sure that anyone who has anything to do with the building of bridges or highways knows that most of these facilities will be worn out inside of 50 years. These communities will borrow money and put more debt on their children and their grandchildren to pay for them, but these facilities will be worn out even before the debt is paid. In addition to that, everyone knows that if you add the 2½ percent interest on a 50-year loan, it will add to the cost of the project, and that terrific interest will be added to make the cost at least 2 or 3 times higher.

Now, in conclusion, may I say this, that many States, including Illinois, place a limit on loans. The constitution of the State of Illinois says that a subdivision cannot borrow money for over 20 years. I am sure that is true of many other States. In other words, the people who wrote the constitution in Illinois and other States had sense enough to know that no subdivision of government should come in and borrow for a period in excess of 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I might say I hope that this rule is voted down.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMUNITIES FACILITIES BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, first, I am for a balanced budget. I have always voted that way and expect to continue to. I am for a definite plan for the retirement of the national debt. The suggestion of the President that we increase our national debt without a plan for its orderly retirement every year, when we can, I think is very inflationary. We have 5.5 million unemployed people today. Seven percent of the labor force are without jobs.

This bill will do a lot toward bringing job opportunities for these people. It is needed now to relieve unemployment. That is a No. 1 need.

Just within the last few months, according to the reserve bulletin issued yesterday, the Federal Reserve System has reduced the reserve requirements of member banks, so that the banks have been able to buy, and have bought, \$6.2 billion of Government bonds, absolutely free of charge.

The reserves were given to them. The banks did not have to pay a penny for them. They did not put up any money. Why should we quibble now about the \$2 billion of additional credit when we let the banks have \$6.2 billion without putting up anything, and let them draw the interest on it for the next 50 years? Why should we quibble now about \$2 billion that is to be used in the people's interest for the things that they need? Money that will be paid back with interest.

It is said by some that the interest rate provided in this bill is too low—2½ percent. It is not too low. There is a difference between types of bonds that are issued. These 2½ percent bonds issued by the communities would be nontaxable bonds; they would be tax exempt. That is equal to about 5½ percent to a person in the 50 percent income tax bracket or to a corporation that pays 52 percent. A 2½ percent interest rate is plenty high. If the rate were any higher the bill would not help the local communities, and it would not encourage the building of needed facilities, which is its purpose.

If the Government buys these 2½ percent bonds, the Government will issue taxable bonds to get the money, let us say at 3 percent. The Government invariably would get one-third of that interest back. That is 1 percent that the Government will get in taxes which, added to the 2½ percent, would make it 3½ percent. So the Government is not going to lose any money on these bonds at 2½ percent. There is no way by which it can lose any money.

WHOSE MONEY IS BEING BORROWED?

Furthermore, who issues the money? Who owns the money? Whose money is being borrowed?

Our constituents are going to come to us sometime and ask us to tell them why it is that we allow the private banks to issue the money, upon the credit of the Nation, and then we bid for it back—our own money. Where do we get our money? It is based upon the credit of the Nation and the gold that we have. The

gold is owned by the Government, too. So, if we are going to issue the money and distribute it, should we not have something to say about the interest rate, when we are using it for the general welfare of all the people? Of course, we should.

GREATNESS OF A NATION

Let me tell you one thing this money will be used for. It will be used to build nursing and convalescent homes for our aged people. There are many ways of measuring the greatness of a nation. But one of the best ways to measure the greatness of a nation is in the care and consideration it gives to its aged people. In this bill we are taking a long step in the direction of establishing nursing and convalescent homes for the aged; places where they can get medical care and other care at reasonable cost. If we vote against this rule we would be voting against these important facilities, too.

TAX-EXEMPT WEALTH

During the 1930's when our debts—Federal, State, and local—were becoming so much larger than ever before in history, efforts were made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt; Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau; and many others, including outstanding Republican leaders, to stop the issuance and sale of more tax-exempt bonds. When the amount of such bonds was limited, there was no problem; but with the amount greatly increasing, they are looked upon as a tax haven for the wealthy and would permit a large part of the wealth of the Nation to escape its fair share of the burdens of taxation. It was discovered that the issuance of State and local bonds could not be changed from nontaxable to taxable but the Federal bonds were changed and since that time, we have not issued tax-exempt bonds and practically all the outstanding Federal securities at this time are taxable.

There is a way that the nontaxable bond problem can be solved. The very bill under consideration points in that direction. As an illustration, if the Federal Government bought all State and local tax-exempt bonds during this year, 1958, which would amount to probably \$7 billion, the Federal Government could sell its own Federal bonds that are taxable to pay for them. In that way, the tax-exempt bonds would not be used as a haven for the wealthy, as taxable Federal bonds would take their place.

The bankers are wrong in opposing this type legislation. They are opposing it, I am told, because they prefer to deal in tax-exempt bonds. Possibly it is better for the banks to deal in tax-exempt bonds, but the bankers do not need this added revenue. They are doing well over the Nation today and the passage of a bill like the community facilities bill will help the bankers, as well as other segments of our economy. I do not believe that very many of the bankers, if they understood it, would be opposed to this legislation.

If city X needs a million dollars in improvements and votes bonds for that purpose or issues revenue-bearing bonds for that purpose, there is no reason why it is not all right for a Federal Government agency to buy those bonds,

which provide for 2½ percent interest. Then the Federal Government could issue its own bonds at 3 percent or 3¼ percent and sell them in the open market at par and the income from these bonds would be taxable. In that event, city X would sell the Federal Government its million dollars' worth of tax-exempt bonds; the Federal Government would sell \$1 million worth of taxable bonds to pay for them. The nontaxable city X bonds would provide for 2½ percent. The Federal securities of \$1 million providing for 3 or 3¼ percent would be taxable.

I believe it can safely be said that the Government collects at least one-third of the amount of interest that is paid on taxable bonds in income taxes. That being true, the Government would collect 1 percent on the million dollars' worth of Federal bonds and would receive 2½ percent from city X. That would give the Government a sufficient flexible return to guarantee a real profit in the transaction. The Federal Government could well afford to consider a plan that would entice all tax-exempt bonds into a Federal agency in this way and not have a large part of the wealth of our Nation escaping taxation.

Much study and thought would have to be given such a plan, but since there is no way to stop the issuance of tax-exempt bonds in the States, cities, and political subdivisions, this plan could be used as a basis in our efforts to replace tax-exempt bonds with taxable bonds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider the bill that would be made in order under this rule, if adopted, is a political measure. I think instead it is an economic and fiscal problem which confronts us here this afternoon.

This bill originated in the Senate, as you have all noted. The Senate bill, as I believe has been explained here, carried \$1 billion in, not authorizations, but appropriations. The bill which is now before us carries \$2 billion, as amended by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, in an appropriation, not an authorization. However, I understand the committee has agreed to offer an amendment that would change it to a simple authorization rather than an appropriation.

The Senate bill provided the expenditures set up under the bill would include funds for public school construction. For some reason, unknown to me, the Committee on Banking and Currency, in its wisdom, saw fit to eliminate school construction and instead specifically spelled out the bill shall not apply to schools.

The difficulty with considering this bill at this present time is that we are now facing a \$12 billion deficit, by the end of the present fiscal year 1959, or on June 30 of next year, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, and perhaps even more.

The chairman of the great House Committee on Ways and Means was before the Committee on Rules just the other day and told us that in his opinion public spending would run at least, under present conditions, without adding these new pieces of legislation to it, \$400 billion in the 5 years starting with this fiscal year. He also expressed the opinion, and I think he is a very learned man, that by the time we are able to balance the budget again the national debt may reach \$360 to \$375 billion.

So I am of the opinion that whether you think this legislation is good or bad it ought not to be considered until we can see a little further ahead, and know just what our fiscal situation is, and whether or not we can prevent ruinous inflation in this country, or whether or not we can cut the cost of Government so as to partially balance the budget, or can at least reduce the annual deficit, especially in view of world conditions as they exist today.

There has been a great deal of talk about the need for this legislation, and perhaps there is some need for some of these facilities that have been mentioned in the various communities across the Nation. Yet I would like to point out to you that I have thus far been unable to find a single community in the United States, a single political subdivision, that is not in better financial condition than is the United States Government itself. Every dollar that may be paid out of the Federal Treasury under this \$2 billion program has to be borrowed, and interest has to be paid on it, of course, by the taxpayers.

I think I should also point out that this \$2 billion is not the limit, but it is just the beginning, because, if this new program is put into effect, then certainly, if the money is expended, pressure will come from other communities that have not yet been granted loans or funds under this legislation that we appropriate and make more money available for the same purposes in the years ahead.

Let me remind you that we have never started a spending program by the Federal Government in our history that has ever stopped when it was supposed to have stopped. It has been continued, and continued, and continued. We have great starting facilities but we have poor terminal facilities in the Congress of the United States.

I should like to point out some other things: This legislation covers the construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, and bridges, all of which are covered under the Federal Highway Act, and upon which we are now spending great sums of money.

It covers parking lots and airports. We have a program for airport construction in this country now. This would be in addition to it.

It also covers public transportation facilities. The Congress has cared for public transportation facilities in the bill that was approved here just yesterday under a conference report on the Transportation Act of 1958.

It provides funds for public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers, and public nursing and convalescent homes,

all of which are provided for, and have been for years, under the Hill-Burton Act, another piece of legislation that has been approved by Congress. We have met that need in this country.

It also provides for refuse- and garbage-disposal plants. I do not know of any public legislation for that. Then the bill goes on to provide for sewage disposal plants, and we have already provided for them. We have provided for that under separate legislation, the Anti-Pollution Act, so, actually, practically everything covered in this bill, or the purposes for which it is supposed to be designed, have been taken care of by legislation previously approved by this Congress. I think under such conditions, we ought to stop, look, and listen, defeat this rule, and hold up this legislation until next year when we can get another look at it, and determine if it is a wise thing to do in the face of this growing danger of inflation, and ever-rising Government deficit and debt that we now have under present conditions. I hope this rule will be defeated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think it has been amply demonstrated that this bill is completely unnecessary. We are not in a depression today. There are ample funds in local communities obtainable from private sources to finance legitimate projects on a local level.

What disturbs me is the same thing which disturbs the speaker who has just concluded. We are faced today with this situation. There are, perhaps, 2 weeks of the Congress remaining and backed up behind this bill are a large number of other wild spending bills. If we do not now turn off the faucet today, then I predict that next year we will not have a \$12 billion deficit as predicted, but perhaps a \$15 billion deficit or a \$20 billion deficit.

Here is a real opportunity for the House of Representatives to speak out and say we have had enough of wild, uncontrolled spending at least in this session of the Congress. I hope the rule is defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule providing for the consideration of a bill to authorize the Treasury to purchase municipal bonds at a rate of 2½ percent and issue Government bonds at a rate of something like 3 to 3½ percent in order to help municipalities and counties to finance what they regard as useful projects. It has been argued here that this is a profitable transaction for the Government, that we are going to borrow money at 3¼ percent and lend it out at 2½ percent and collect income tax on it and we are going to make money out of it. I do not know what is the matter with that argument. It sounds pretty cogent to me. But, if that is a good argument, I do not see why we do not issue a trillion dollars worth of bonds and pay off the national debt.

It sort of reminds me of an old fellow who came into a bank some time ago. He had a note there that he wanted to renew. So he filled out a new note and handed it across the counter. The teller handed him the old note. He took the old note, threw it in the wastebasket, rubbed his hands together and said, "Thank God that is paid." If we keep on with that kind of financing, I am just wondering where we are going to wind up. It is a matter of cold fact and everybody knows that municipal bonds are the most desirable investment that we now have. They are selling at rates of interest cheaper than Government bonds, and here is a sheet which just came to my desk this morning consisting of 4 pages of single-spaced type listing and offering municipal bonds from all over the country selling at rates of 1 percent up to 3 percent and most of them at about 2 to 2½ percent. We do not need this thing. Why are we doing it? I just cannot understand it. We have been talking about adjourning this Congress and getting out of here. I am going to tell you what is upstairs in the Rules Committee behind this. We brought down this bill. That is \$2 billion. We have an education bill coming on right behind it, and that is \$1,070 million. Then you have got a mineral-subsidy bill coming on, and that is \$650 million. I understand there is a housing bill in the offing which I understand will be about \$2½ billion. You have got a depressed-areas bill, whatever that means, about \$275 million. I do not know what else is coming along. But that adds up to \$5,830 million, and the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has just asked me to call the Rules Committee together to consider a bill to raise the debt limit. In last January you raised the debt limit from \$275 billion to \$280 billion. The bill that is coming to you next week raises it from \$280 billion to \$285 billion, with a \$3 billion temporary increase, to make it \$288 billion.

Well, here you are getting ready, even before you get the pen dry on that bill, to dish out \$5,830 million more. If we do that, we cannot adjourn. We have got to come back the following week and increase the debt limit some more.

Now, what are we thinking about? Everybody knows that we are heading into disastrous inflation just as rapidly as we can go. Let us stop some of these things. Let us adjourn this Congress like we ought to do.

I appreciate the applause from the left, but my Democratic friends seem to want to stay here. I do not know what they want to stay here for, unless it is to spend some more money. We have spent all the money we have got. Maybe this scheme that my friend talks about—that you can loan money at 2½ and borrow it back at 3¼—maybe that will make us rich. If it does, it was not the way I was raised in financial matters.

Now, to show you just how these things grow like Topsy: The 1954 municipal facilities bill called for a little sum, just a little taste, \$100 million. Now we come along and the Senate sends us a bill for over a billion dollars. The House doubles the ante. They outbid them, and

we bid \$2 billion. The bill started out to be for small communities, communities that probably did not have a market for their bonds—communities of not over 10,000 people. This bill wipes that out. The big cities of this country can take every dollar of that money, and your little municipalities will not get any. That is what this bill does.

My friends, I think this has gone far enough. I think we ought to quit. I think we ought to defeat this rule, instead of spending 2 or 3 days on it, as we probably will, and then I think we ought to begin to wind up the business of this Congress and just quit and give the country a little breathing spell. Maybe it will give them a little encouragement if we wind up the business of this Congress and go on home. Let us defeat this rule; let us go home and give the country a little time to catch up with what we have been doing to them in the last 6 months.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I realize, of course, that a measure such as this has a certain appeal to many of us; likewise, many of us know very well some of the people who are proposing this legislation—we respect them and admire them—and, as a result, find it a little difficult to take the positions that we sometimes do.

I want to say, first of all, that I am against this rule and I am against the bill. As for the rule, I realize there are many Members who think every measure that is reported out of the Rules Committee should be considered by the House. There are many reasons why that sort of understanding should not prevail. Sometimes rules come out of the Rules Committee, and perhaps bills may come out of the legislative committees, in respect to which there is great pressure; and that is understandable. But it is always a different matter to convince the House as to whether or not such legislation is wise and good.

There is another factor that has become apparent here. It has been suggested that there is a bypassing of the Appropriations Committee. That is to be taken out. I have heard other suggestions that the interest rate is recognized now as being too low and that the rate should be revised upward. It is also suggested that this \$2 billion item against the national debt is too high and that it should be amended downward. All this simply means that here we have brought to the floor a bill, the sponsors of which are ready to take apart. Well, if it is to be taken apart the rule ought to be defeated, the bill sent back to the committee and they should be allowed to do the job on it that needs to be done. It can then be brought back to us and defended.

All of the argument to this point has been that this is somehow an antirecession measure. If you read the majority report, and I must say I am not going to get into politics, but when you read that majority report you will see that it is filled with it in many instances. It is all geared somehow to this business of dealing with a recession.

The situation today, and I am happy that this statement can be made, the situation today in that respect is entirely different from what it was when this legislation was initiated.

Be that as it may, let me just say this to you: My information is that the borrowings of municipalities and local governments last year was around \$7 billion and the interest rate was about 4 percent if the municipality itself was back of it, and about 4½ percent if the borrower had to look to revenues for the return. Bring this bill out, hold out the promise of 2½ percent interest and what mayor of any town or city could go, as they have been going to the tune of \$7 billion—would go out and get money at 4 percent or 4½ percent? The further argument is made that the bonds will be free of income tax. Well, the municipal bonds are free of Federal taxation.

But what mayor could go back to his people and justify that kind of borrowing when the money would be available out of the revolving fund at some future time and by waiting his turn he could get it at 2½ percent?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. My time is very short; I am sorry I cannot yield.

We have an existing program. The very promise that, through legislation like this, money probably will be available at 2½ percent has resulted in a deceleration of the existing program. You understand that under existing law the Administrator is lending the money at comparable rates, that is, comparable to what municipalities themselves can borrow if for. It was initiated, as has been said, to help local communities under 10,000 population because those were the places which found it difficult to get money. The big municipalities do not have any trouble floating their bonds. They have access to the money markets and they have been able to get the money.

So, what is the end result of this legislation? It simply is that the very promise of it has decelerated the existing program. If we want to do something here that will become law—I say this will not become law if it does pass in its present form—we could take the present program and if more than the \$100 million now available is needed, increase that amount by some reasonable figure and go on about our business with the program we presently have. But I say the very promise of the 2½-percent money will not supplement the building we would otherwise have; it would supplant a part of it and stop the rest of it. To my mind that adds to more unemployment; it does not help to reduce unemployment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the matter we are now considering.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on S. 3497, the Community Facilities Act of 1958. In my judgment, this is one of the most im-

portant measures considered by this session of Congress. It represents one of the most concrete antirecession programs proposed and I fervently hope that it will receive the speedy approval of the House.

Put simply, this is a bill to create employment and to put the unemployed back to work. Our committee has reported this bill against a backdrop of serious economic decline. At a time when we have nearly 5½ million unemployed and 1.6 million additional workers forced to work part time—at a time when we have no assurance that economic recovery is in sight—at such a time it would be the height of folly to vacillate and to pursue a course of inaction.

Let no one kid you that we are completely out of the woods in this present recession. It is conceivable that we are in truth bumping along the bottom and that miraculously economic recovery will take place soon. But it is only conceivable—it is not a proven fact. One group of economists can cite arguments to prove that the bottom has been reached and that recovery will soon set in. But another group of economists can present an equally convincing thesis that at the very least we may stay in the present trough for an uncomfortably long time and at the very worst we may be courting economic disaster unless we take steps to rejuvenate our lagging economy.

Remember this recession is a horse of a different color than the two preceding ones. The 1949–50 and 1953–54 recessions were plain and simply inventory recessions. This recession, gentlemen, is much more ominous because it has all the earmarks of a classical capital goods depression. The prime mover in the economic boom of 1955–56 was an unprecedented rate of investment by business of plant and equipment. But that investment boom has run its course. It began to slacken in mid-1957 and the rate of investment is now falling steadily. Latest projections are that plant and equipment investment in 1958 will be 17 percent below last year.

Also by mid-1957, the effects of the administration's tight money policy were beginning to be felt. The tight money policy had decimated the ranks of small business and was further worsening the serious economic plight of the farmer, particularly the small farmer. The long-sought objection of the proponents of the hard-money policy—to take the steam out of the economic boom—was finally being achieved.

The trend of the economy was further aggravated by the short-sighted administration policy which called for a reduction in defense contracts and spending at a time when the harmful effects of such a policy should have been crystal clear. A further aggravating factor in the worsening economic situation was the noticeable distortion in the pattern of income distribution which has resulted from the policies pursued during the past 5 years. Interest and dividend income has risen much more rapidly than wages, while farm income has actually fallen precipitously over the period, with its inevitable harmful effect on the

purchasing power of the farming community.

In the fact of these developments and policies, retribution in our economy was inevitable. We were plunged into serious recession and that, gentlemen, is where we still are today.

It is indeed heartening that some economic indicators have shown a modest improvement. Industrial production in May and June have shown a slight increase, and personal income has been maintained at a high level. Also, inventory liquidation has continued steadily, offering the hope that at some future point businesses will start replenishing depleted stocks and set in motion a period of inventory accumulation.

But, by and large, I am convinced that the most recent economic indicators, while they may indicate that the worst has been experienced, still are no cause for complacency.

The unemployment situation in June was most disturbing. Unemployment rose to nearly 5.5 million, the highest point since the summer of 1941. I recognize that part of this may be seasonal, attributable to the increased number of college and high-school graduates seeking work, but the fact is still indisputable that 5½ million Americans are idle. Our economy is suffering because it is losing the increased production which would be achieved if these unfortunate people were able to find work. And even more disturbing is our acute awareness of the economic hardship which these unfortunate people are suffering. I am also concerned because there are still approximately 1.6 million persons who are forced to work only part time. Taken together, these statistics mean that more than 7 million American families are feeling directly the unhappy consequences of the economic recession.

The latest labor market report of the Labor Department showed a further worsening in July. In mid-July 89 major job centers out of a total of 149 were classed as areas of "substantial labor surplus," that is with 6 percent or more of their labor force out of work. This was an increase of 3 metropolitan areas since mid-May and is the largest total since the classification system began operating 7 years ago. A year and a half ago only 19 major job centers were in this hard-hit category.

The number of smaller labor-market areas with 6 percent or more unemployed also increased. From mid-May 21 smaller labor-market areas were added to the surplus labor category, bringing the total of such areas to 182.

This latest unemployment report is especially worrisome because seasonal shifts are ignored in determining the category in which a city is to be placed. Therefore the June influx of job-seeking students did not distort this picture as it did the overall unemployment report in June. Moreover, cities were classified as high-unemployment centers only if there was prospect of little change through September.

I am proud of our committee and the bill that has been brought on the floor today. This bill has guts to it—it will provide the means to stimulate economic activity. It will add to construction em-

ployment. It will result in much-needed and long-deferred public works construction which our communities need.

The economic effects of the bill will have what economists call the multiplier effect. By stimulating construction, it will increase the flow of purchasing power through the blood stream of our economy.

The bill will result in immediate employment of construction workers at the project site, but in addition, by creating a broad demand for all of the products which go into new construction, it will have an important influence in expanding economic activity and employment opportunity throughout the general economy.

Now how would the bill achieve these objectives? It would authorize \$2 billion of Federal funds for loans through the community facilities program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The present program is doing a useful job in providing sewer and water facilities for our smaller towns but it is too limited in scope to be effective as an anti-recession measure. The \$2 billion in loan funds would be made available to local communities on extremely favorable terms. The interest rate would be 2½ percent and the loan term could extend to 50 years.

All kinds of projects would be eligible, including sewer and water facilities, street construction, public police and fire protection facilities, libraries, and virtually all kinds of public buildings and facilities.

The economic impact of the program shall take effect within a relatively short period. I would like to emphasize that there presently exists a substantial backlog of planned projects under the program of planning advances of public works under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954. Plans for projects with a projected construction cost of an estimated \$310 million have been completed and are ready for speedy construction. Planning advances have been approved for additional projects totaling about \$566 million. There is, of course, an unknown substantial total of projects which have been planned without Federal assistance which are also ready for construction. Testimony before our committee and documents submitted for the record indicate that many of these projects would result in early construction.

Not only will the bill help get us out of the recession and put the unemployed back to work, but it also will provide facilities and public works which our communities urgently need and which have been too long deferred. Our cities have been losing ground in their struggle to provide the community facilities and public works which our country needs. Every structure, every facility produced under the proposed program will have lasting merit and utility and will contribute to our national stock of essential community facilities.

The provision of financing on the liberal terms provided in the bill will encourage municipalities which might not otherwise be planning community facilities or public works in the immediate future, to review their capital investment

programs and decide to undertake projects at once. The paramount and overriding consideration is to stimulate construction and economic activity generally so that jobs can be immediately created and so that once again we can have a framework of economic expansion and optimism.

Mr. Speaker, to me the issue involved here today is crystal clear. This is a time for the American people to find out where we stand. There is no gray area of uncertainty here—the issue is black and white. A vote for this bill is a vote to attack the recession and restore the 5½ million unemployed to gainful and productive employment. A vote against the bill is a vote to let the unemployed continue in their misery, and even worse to run the risk that the total of unemployed will swell to even more ominous proportions.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must fill the vacuum created by the administration's lack of leadership on the recession problem. We must take a positive and forthright approach to offset the administration's apathetic wait-and-see attitude. We cannot take risks with so grave a problem. We have a clear call to action, Mr. Speaker, and the bill will provide an essential program in our fight to restore full employment to the American economy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation which is of vital importance to many thousands of communities throughout the country. It will make possible the type of expansion programs which are urgently needed to restore our Nation to a full-employment economy.

This measure is sound and reasonable. It has been the subject of intense study in both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees. It is strongly supported as a major antirecession weapon in the committee report:

Your committee is convinced that the bill as reported can make a significant contribution to recovery. By providing long-term financing on extremely favorable terms, local governments will be encouraged to undertake community facilities and public works which will have a strong generating effect on the economy. Expenditures on projects of the kind contemplated in the bill will have a substantial multiplier effect. It has been estimated that a \$2 billion program of public works may bring as much as a \$10 billion increase in total output. Steel, lumber, cement, etc., needed for new construction will require more workers who, in turn, will spend their wages on food, clothing, cars, and other commodities. Furthermore, businessmen will also be given the ability and motivation to renew equipment and build new plants as a result of this induced activity.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will make it possible for a beneficial stimulation to the economy to take place in a relatively short time. Many community facility projects have already been approved and have obtained advanced planning grants from HHFA. The construction timetables on these projects could easily be advanced if this legislation is enacted. These are needed projects, such as sewer systems, water-supply projects, sewage-treatment facilities. They are important to smaller

municipalities who could not otherwise afford to undertake such projects.

The charge has been made that this legislation is not necessary because financing is available through municipal bonds sold in the private investment market. It is also contended by the opponents of this legislation that the 2½ percent interest rate will shift the major portion of financing these projects to the Federal Government. These arguments are false and misleading.

Many communities are unable to undertake needed public works projects because they have reached the legal limit of their bonded indebtedness. Moreover, the "hard money, high interest" rate policies of the Eisenhower administration have forced postponement of many such projects because of adverse votes on bond issues at the exorbitant rates of interest being charged by private financial institutions.

The contention that low interest rates provided in this bill will centralize community facility financing in the Federal loan structure overlooks the important provisions of section 202 (b) (1), which provides that priority be given to projects which the administrator determines could not be undertaken without Federal assistance. In the allocation of priorities it is obvious that only those projects which are most worthwhile and needed and which could not be otherwise undertaken will be approved.

This legislation provides the key to the solution of many complex problems which face our cities and towns. It would result in the modernization of outmoded transportation facilities, streets, inadequate public recreational facilities, hospitals, libraries, police and fire protection facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and many other types of similar projects urgently needed in many communities.

Mr. Speaker, by our action on S. 3497 we will decide whether our cities, towns, and villages are to move forward in meeting the needs of our growing population, or whether they will continue the process of gradual decay. We will also decide by our votes whether we are really concerned with strengthening and expanding our national economy and reducing unemployment among our citizens. We can take these important steps forward by voting for S. 3497.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in emphatic opposition to S. 3497, the Community Facilities Act of 1958. I shall not detain the House long.

Whenever some new venture in Federal activity and intervention is proposed in this House, we hear the familiar phrase about getting the camel's nose in the tent. I have used it myself.

This is no camel's nose in the tent proposal. Congress did that earlier. This is a proposal to get the rest of the camel into the tent.

This is a proposal for a \$2 billion Federal revolving loan fund to finance a virtually unlimited range of municipal public works and facilities projects.

These include, but are not limited to, the construction, repair and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other public transporta-

tion facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers and public nursing homes and public convalescent homes; public refuse- and garbage-disposal facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; civil-defense facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public wholesale farm-produce markets; public libraries and offices and other public buildings—other than schools; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

Here in full bloom are the obnoxious fruits of the AFL-CIO proclaimed doctrine that:

Democracy cannot be maintained merely by rigid adherence to forms established to meet yesterday's conditions, especially in a society as fluid as ours. * * * Big though it may have become because of today's needs, the Federal Government is still the people's best guaranty of democracy and well-being.

It is generous, indeed, to propose that Uncle Sam offer to loan money at a loss to local units of government, which money Uncle Sam himself has had to borrow, and is going to have to borrow in increasing amounts.

This House in the next few days will be required to consider a request of the President for a \$10 billion increase in the permanent national debt ceiling, from \$275 to \$285 billion, and a temporary increase of an additional \$3 billion.

Is there no limit to the impudence, the brazenness, and the sheer folly of the advocates of virtually unlimited federalization and centralization of government in these United States?

The proposal now before us plainly demonstrates there is not.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, that our country is experiencing a drastic upheaval in its economic health and well-being is no secret to any Member of this Congress nor, I might add, to anyone of the 5½ million Americans unable to find work today. Only to matters of national defense has this Congress devoted more time, both in committee and on the House and Senate floors, than to legislation aimed at ending this "recession," "depression," "economic downturn"—call it what you will.

In the course of the Banking and Currency Committee's consideration of the community facilities problems facing almost every American city today, it became apparent that a ready and effective tool was at hand to serve a twofold purpose. While helping localities meet their health and welfare needs, Federal assistance in the community facilities field would also prove to be a real weapon in fighting the economic slump. It is to this end that I strongly urge prompt House approval of the rule and of S. 3497 as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The explosive growth which has taken place across the country in our urban and suburban areas may be hard to grasp, even when dramatically proved by population figures, charts, or indexes. But all one has to do to realize that it is taking place is to drive from the middle of his own hometown out toward its outskirts. It will take you far longer to do this now than it would have 10 years

ago and the primary reason for this is people and the necessity to house, school, and care for them. And you will see area after area of new homes where only a short time ago there were farms, meadows, and forests. This is just a taste of things to come. As our population increases at the rate of 3 million a year, it takes little imagination to foresee the explosive expansion in the urban growth of our country.

One of the prime effects of this growth is becoming increasingly self-evident. Cities and towns are literally unable to keep up with themselves. Present water systems, sewage facilities, roads, hospitals and all of the other essential public works have been strained beyond their endurance and are becoming inadequate to perform their old jobs, not to mention all of the new areas which they now must serve. To say that the problems in this field, brought on by the mushrooming expansion of towns and cities, are local problems ignores the fact that they are not being solved and cannot be solved by the localities alone. Failure to solve them results not just in damage to the locality but to the Nation as a whole.

S. 3497 is aimed at helping these towns help themselves. It does not provide for an outright grant program. Instead, the Housing and Home Finance Agency through the Community Facilities Administration would be authorized to loan money to local communities for the construction of public works and projects. This would be done by the purchase of securities and obligations of the local communities or by the making of outright loans. Interest must be paid on this borrowing. The rate of interest would be very favorable—2½ percent per annum—but it would not be a subsidized rate since it would reflect the current cost of borrowing Federal funds. An authorization of \$2 billion in appropriated funds would be made available for the program. The maximum loan term is 50 years; and the borrowers must first show that they have tried to secure the funds by offering their securities or obligations on the private market but have been unable to sell them.

In order to insure that the maximum use of this program is made in connection with the dire need to put people back to work, the Administrator is given authority to grant priority to projects which he decides could not be built without the assistance offered by this bill.

What are the projects I am talking about? An examination of the bill shows it is aimed at construction, repair and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, parks, public hospitals, sewage and garbage facilities, water facilities, police and fire protection projects, just to mention a few items. All of these are essential to orderly and proper growth of our Nation's cities and towns.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress postpones acknowledging its responsibility in this area, it is only postponing the time when it will have to act with far greater involvement than this measure envisages. Some prompt preventive maintenance on our part now will pay big dividends in the future. I, therefore, urge active sup-

port for this rule and the prompt passage of the bill.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for this legislation may be the main reason for its defeat. There is so great a need for public and community facilities throughout the Nation for the improvement, expansion, and replacement of works needed for public services, as well as new communities, that have increased in population at a rapid rate due to the shift of population or the building of cantonments, bases, and so forth, by the services and national defense production centers.

But the fly in the ointment is the \$2 billion expansion provided in this loan program, of which \$400 million will constitute a revolving fund, the interest rate to borrower at 2½ percent. The maximum loan term increased from 40 to 50 years. And the general demand for advantages of this act is the extension of the plan to include all municipalities and other subdivisions of State government without regard to population formerly 50,000.

The program would result in stimulating the economy and aiding topheavy population shift areas in building much needed facilities for public services immediately.

Preference given to projects where, because of hopeless conditions, it could not be realized without this act. Also private nonprofit hospitals are qualified. A State limited to 10 percent use of fund.

The prevailing wage and overtime as covered by the Davis-Bacon Act would apply to projects. The act further increases the authorization for Federal plan advances under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 for \$48 million to \$98 million.

The tremendous building program would pick up the lag in the unemployment crisis. It would improve the employment of public and local services. The vote will be very close but, as usual, millions for overseas spending but zero for a loan, not a gift, to build public works, and so forth, in dire necessity for building up our own economy—the defeat of this rule may affect all such legislation in the future.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the rule on this bill and will oppose the bill if a rule is granted.

Enough has been explained about the broad provisions of this proposed legislation to convince me that it is unsound and one that would encourage uneconomical and unjustified projects of unlimited character as well as doubtful need.

There are many existing statutes under which worthy local and municipal improvement facilities may be extended assistance through Federal loans and grants. It takes considerable time for local interests to plan and raise local contributions before actual construction can be started. For this reason I doubt if the passage of this legislation would materially improve the present unemployment situation.

The Federal Government should not assume the position of overselling local communities on projects which they themselves have not shown sufficient interest to originate.

In view of our enormous public debt, still increasing with no end in sight, it would be unwise to authorize this multiple project grab-bag program that would involve an initial investment of \$2 billion to add to a national debt we should be ashamed to pass on to those who will follow us.

If this Nation "goes to the wall" through fiscal irresponsibility, the blame will rest on the heads of Members of the Congress. Let us make no mistake about it. We Members will be held responsible for our custodianship.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this community facilities bill we are considering today, which would provide that the Government loan \$2 billion at 2½ percent for a 50-year term to any or all municipalities in the Nation, is the worst piece of legislation that has come before the Congress this session.

The Government would have to sell bonds to the people to secure the funds to loan and then, at this low rate, the Government would be loaning money to municipalities throughout the Nation for less than the Government had to pay for the money.

With the Federal debt limit being raised to \$288 billion, this should be a warning to Members of Congress that any municipality that wants to develop improvements is more able to finance its own projects than is the Federal Government. The liberals and spenders, being urged on by the CIO and other labor leaders, are certainly going too far when they propose legislation like this. It shows how irresponsible some Members of Congress have become.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill was passed, and it will not be because we are going to defeat it, it would increase inflation; it would stop billions of dollars of private municipal funds from coming into the market to build municipal improvements because they would all want to come to the Federal Government to get the money at a cheaper rate on longer terms.

I submit this question to the Members of this Congress: How reckless, yes, how irresponsible and how silly can we get? If this bill is passed, it would increase the budget by \$2 billion; it would increase the taxes of all the people by millions of dollars; it would prevent men and women from being put to work, and it would bring about greater inflation and increase the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I would like to point out: This money can be spent for hospitals, recreational centers, roads, sewers, disposal plants, parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, parking lots, schools, and, it would seem, for any purpose whatsoever.

Under the Hill-Burton Act and other legislation we have provided for schools and hospitals. We have provided billions for the expansion of roads and public highways, and, in fact, legislation is on the books that provides for everything for which this money is proposed to be spent.

It would raise the taxes of 80,000 farmers in my district next year and for 50 years to come, and it is doubtful whether any of them would receive any benefits.

I would like to point out that the farmers now are being taxed on \$5 billion, that

will run for 40 years, for one phase of housing known as "public housing," to help pay the rent of people living in the big cities in low-rent housing units. The farmers are being taxed to help redevelop the big cities of the Nation to help pay over \$2 billion that has been given them free, like the \$5 billion that has been given free to help face-lift the big cities and some smaller ones throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed this Federal housing thing and this urban-renewal housing that has already cost over \$7 billion since I came to Congress, knowing that it is unfair to the people in the small towns and communities; to the laboring man and to the farmers, who pay for their own homes, and pay their own rent, to tax them again to pay over one-third of the rent of a million people living in modern housing in the cities who never pay over two-thirds of the normal rental in those cities.

I wish the Members of Congress who represent small towns and agricultural areas would realize the unfairness of voting for this public housing and urban renewal, and putting this extra tax load, so unjustified, upon the citizens they represent. I am sure if the citizens realized that many Members of Congress are imposing this extra burden upon them, and taking billions of tax money out of these communities throughout the United States, transferring it to build up the big cities, that they would soon convince their Representatives in Congress that they should change their thinking and voting with reference to public housing and urban renewal.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in supporting this legislation, the community facilities bill, I do so because of the great need for Congressional action at this time.

Too many Members are ready and willing to vote for so-called foreign aid with the Economic Development Fund to spend American dollars for community facilities in underdeveloped countries. To do less in our country is shortsighted and in a sense, against the best interest of our country, its communities, and its peoples.

Let us see what S. 3497 will do for the people. This bill as reported by the committee, would rewrite title II of the housing amendments of 1955, which authorized Federal loans for public facilities. The bill would make the following major changes in this loan program:

First. The fund for community facilities and public works loans would be increased to \$2 billion, of which \$400 million would constitute a revolving fund.

Second. The formula for computing the maximum interest rate to the borrower would be revised to produce a maximum rate, under present conditions, of 2½ percent.

Third. The maximum loan term would be raised from 40 years to 50 years.

Fourth. The existing program has been limited in practice to communities of 50,000 population or less; the bill extends the program to all municipalities and other political subdivisions of States without regard to population.

Fifth. Eligibility would be extended specifically to a wide range of facilities

and projects. Priority would be given to projects which the administration determines could not be undertaken without the bill's assistance.

Sixth. Private nonprofit hospitals would be made eligible for loans under the bill.

Seventh. The amount of the authorization which could be used in any one State would be limited to 10 percent.

Eighth. The prevailing-wage and overtime requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act would apply to projects financed under the bill.

In addition, the bill would increase the authorization for Federal planning advances under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 from \$48 million to \$98 million.

The primary and urgent purpose of this community-facilities and public-works bill is to provide a much-needed stimulus to our lagging economy, to increase the flow of the purchasing power into the hands of the consumer, and to reduce the alarming ranks of the unemployed. It will provide a valuable tool in the fight against the current economic slump. Basically, the bill would provide a substantial sum of money for long-term loans on liberal terms to municipalities and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of many types of worthy community facilities and public works. I am convinced that the program will furnish a vitally needed economic stimulus and, at the same time, will enable communities to build essential and desirable public facilities which would not otherwise go forward.

The bill is a product of careful study and deliberation by the committee. It was one of the major pieces of legislation considered during an extended series of hearings on legislation to relieve unemployment. During the hearings, which began on April 14 and continued through May 22, the committee received testimony from witnesses of the highest caliber and competence, men of proved achievement and ability in their fields. The list of witnesses included former President Harry S. Truman, distinguished governors from 10 of our great States, distinguished mayors, top labor and business leaders, the leaders of the three major farm organizations, top administration officials, and Members of Congress. The cooperation of these witnesses was of invaluable assistance to the committee and their contribution has helped to improve both the content and quality of the bill.

In framing the bill your committee considered S. 3497, passed by the Senate on April 16, 1958; H. R. 11474 and H. R. 11272; and the reported bill incorporates features from all three bills.

The whole problem of aid to communities is not new. In 1955 Congress passed a community-facilities bill which set up a revolving fund of \$100 million restricted to loans for smaller communities. Smaller communities have been defined as communities under 10,000 population, although the act actually contemplated communities of 50,000. Most of this money has been used for sewerage and water facilities.

This bill goes much further, not alone in its extension to all communities but

also in its realistic increase in both the amount of money and the longer terms for the duration of the loan at lower interest rates.

Personally I can see no logic in a situation which refuses to lend money to our communities while at the same time, giving money, without hope of return, to foreign communities.

The vote to defeat the rule on this bill is of course a vote against the bill.

Any Congressman voting for foreign redevelopment and against local home community redevelopment loans should take another look at the situation and consider voting for loans to our communities for the construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other public transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers and public nursing homes and public convalescent homes; public refuse and garbage-disposal facilities, water, sewage and sanitary facilities, and other public-utility facilities; civil-defense facilities, public police and fire protection facilities; public wholesale farm produce markets; public libraries and offices and other public buildings—other than schools—and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

Loans to nonprofit hospitals to finance specific projects for hospital construction, repair, or improvement are also made eligible under the bill.

To insure that assistance under the bill will be channeled primarily into projects that will create employment, there is included in the committee substitute a requirement that in extending such assistance the Administrator shall grant priority to projects which he determines could not be undertaken without such assistance. Applications of communities which demonstrate that the project involved could not be undertaken without Federal assistance would be processed ahead of applications where such a showing is not made.

To assure a roughly equitable distribution of the loan funds, borrowing in any one State could not exceed 10 percent of the funds provided—including repayments into the revolving fund.

There are many features of the act that will be covered in other speeches and the report of the committee on this bill is an outstanding book of information concerning public expenditures under previous acts, and contemplated spending under this act. In the light of the severe opposition, and to my mind unsound arguments advanced by the opposition, I believe it is time to make a comparison of public expenditures under the present local facilities bill and the expenditures under the foreign aid facilities bill.

Under the present law there is a revolving fund of \$100 million available for the smaller communities. Under the foreign aid bill there is at the present time, \$8,278,000,000 with \$595 million earmarked for facilities in foreign countries. Added to this, there is another \$912 million unexpended out of

this grand total, allocated for spending in development and redevelopment of these foreign communities.

As a matter of information I believe the following list of programs and the amounts allocated to each program is of utmost importance to local officials, particularly those who have begged this Congress to back legislation covering their communities for, if not more, at least one-half as much as we are giving to the foreign countries. I would like to have this schedule become part of the Record and I want to thank Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana, for making it available to me.

Although defeat of the rule appears to be the order of the day, I cannot help but feel that failure to pass this legislation would be a severe blow to our economy and especially to the many local governments that have been looking forward to this aid.

Program by name and amount (House bill)

	Total available for expenditure
1. Military assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	\$3,359,502,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	1,515,000,000
Total.....	4,874,502,000
2. Defense support:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	910,688,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	700,000,000
Total.....	1,610,688,000
3. Development Loan Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	295,118,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	300,000,000
Total.....	595,118,000
4. Development assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	168,211,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	185,000,000
Total.....	353,211,000
5. Special assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	126,288,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	185,000,000
Total.....	311,288,000
6. President's Asian fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	88,677,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	185,000,000
Total.....	273,677,000
7. President's contingency fund (new program):	
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	100,000,000
Total.....	100,000,000
8. Technical cooperation, bilateral:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	165,899,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	150,000,000
Total.....	315,899,000
9. Technical cooperation, U. N.:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	9,500,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	20,000,000
Total.....	29,500,000
10. Technical cooperation, Organization of American States:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	998,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	1,500,000
Total.....	2,498,000
11. Joint control:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	6,770,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	1,000,000
Total.....	7,770,000
12. Atoms for peace:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	6,100,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	5,500,000
Total.....	11,600,000
13. North Atlantic Treaty Organization:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	1,000,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	1,000,000
Total.....	2,000,000

Program by name and amount (House bill) —
Continued

	Total available for expenditure
14. Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	\$5,500,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	12,500,000
Total.....	18,000,000
15. U. N. Refugee Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	1,200,000
Total.....	1,200,000
16. Escapee program:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	1,800,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	8,600,000
Total.....	10,400,000
17. U. N. Children's Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	6,775,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	11,000,000
Total.....	17,775,000
18. U. N. Relief and Works Agency:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	6,428,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	25,000,000
Total.....	31,428,000
19. Ocean freight:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	100,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	2,100,000
Total.....	2,200,000
20. Control Act:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	160,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	1,000,000
Total.....	1,160,000
21. Administrative expenses, ICA:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	5,511,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	33,000,000
Total.....	38,511,000
22. Administrative expenses, State:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	3,105,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	6,692,500
Total.....	9,797,500
23. Hungarian refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	6,500,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	
Total.....	6,500,000
24. Egyptian refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	200,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	
Total.....	200,000
25. Polish refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	5,600,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	
Total.....	5,600,000
26. German refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	1,123,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	
Total.....	1,123,000
27. Undistributed-unexplained:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	17,693,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	
Total.....	17,693,000
28. Undistributed-unexplained:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958.....	746,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959.....	
Total.....	746,000
Grand total.....	8,278,084,500

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I must oppose S. 3497, which would establish a \$2 billion fund for low-interest Federal loans to municipalities and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of a wide range of public facilities such as sidewalks, highways, and water and sewage facilities.

The proponents of this legislation originally claimed that its primary and urgent purpose was to provide a much-needed stimulus for our economy. However, the fact that the economy is al-

ready picking up more rapidly than anticipated, for which we are all deeply thankful, removes this argument. The legislation requires the setting up of a whole new program which could not get into operation for months. It would then take still more months for planning and letting contracts before actual construction could be started. Furthermore, the bill would aid primarily the construction industry where unemployment is not critical, and not help the industries where unemployment is most serious.

In addition, no showing has been made that there is, in fact, a shortage of private capital available at relatively low rates of interest to finance public improvements.

Again, some provisions in the bill would encourage and facilitate the undertaking of projects which are unsound and unwise, and thereby divert capital from more essential and important projects.

Besides being unnecessary, there is every reason to believe that passage of this bill would, in fact, delay the construction of community facilities presently being planned in all parts of the country. Once it appears that Federal loan funds may become available on the basis of lower interest rates, it would be inevitable that municipalities would hold up on their present programs of construction in the hope that sooner or later they might be able to get some of the Federal funds. Thus, instead of encouraging the rapid construction of municipal improvements, the measure could have a directly opposite result, to the detriment of both the municipality involved and the overall economy.

We should also not forget that an authorization of an additional \$2 billion of Federal funds for loan purposes would add dangerously to the fires of inflation which is the most serious threat our country presently faces in the economic field.

To sum it up, the measure before us would not be effective as an antirecession bill, is not necessary, would actually result in construction delays, and, in the final effect, would only increase the danger of inflation.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill should be defeated at this time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how this great House of Representatives can even consider a bill which will supplant the private investment markets by Government funds when the Government is broke and we have to raise the debt limit. I hope we will vote down this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, enough has been said concerning this bill and the facts have been ably presented by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The point I desire to make is the overlapping authority that is provided for in

this bill and emphasize the point that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] made. If this bill is passed, you will grant authority for the construction of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other public transportation facilities, public parks and other public recreational facilities, public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers, and public nursing homes and public convalescent homes.

Mr. Speaker, many of these things have already been provided for. As a matter of fact, in the housing bill that was reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday for public housing and homes, nursing homes are provided for in that bill. Airports, I understand, is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that is considering a bill to aid airports. Certainly we do not need a duplication of that. So far as public wholesale and farm produce markets are concerned, that was a matter that came before the House last week and we refused to consider the bill. We provide for sanitary facilities and other public utility facilities, as well as civil defense facilities, public police and fire protection facilities. As a matter of fact, \$2 billion would not be enough if we are going to go into all of the things provided for in this bill.

Furthermore, we are going so far as to provide for public land, water, and timber conservation facilities. If all of the communities in the United States that might seek aid under this bill would apply or make application for funds for projects that they cannot find the money in the ordinary finance market, \$2 billion would not be enough.

Certainly with the addition of \$2 billion on the public debt at this time, we ought to stop passing this kind of legislation and I recommend that the rule be defeated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, S. 3497, as rewritten by the Committee on Banking and Currency, is known as the Community Facilities Act of 1958. This act would rewrite title II of the housing amendments of 1955, which authorized Federal loans for public facilities. S. 3497 makes the following major changes in the Federal loan program:

First. The fund for community facilities and public works loans would be increased to \$2 billion. The Senate action provided for loans up to \$1 billion. The House Banking and Currency Committee has therefore doubled the original intentions of the Senate with regard to these loans.

Second. The formula for computing maximum interest rate as set down in the Senate bill was 3¼ percent. The House committee action on these loans provides for an interest of 2½ percent.

There are those who may argue that Federal loans to aid in the installation of public facilities is a proper procedure on the part of the Government, but many of these same individuals contend that an interest rate of 2½ percent is unrealistic. They much prefer the Senate action in

this respect, which provides for an interest rate of $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent.

Many of the bills of this character which have passed the House of Representatives provided that money may be loaned to firms or municipalities when they are not able to obtain such funds on favorable terms. As S. 3497 is written there appears the following statement on this subject:

No financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms and conditions.

The language of this bill which has just been quoted squeezes out private lenders in most cases and makes it almost necessary for the municipality to come to the Federal Government for its loan. It is believed this sort of a program is a socialistic one and puts the Government in the lending business to the elimination of all private lenders.

The rate of 2½ percent is unrealistic. The Senate bill is more nearly in accord with conditions as we find them today. There is no assurance that the Government will be able to borrow money at all times during the next 50 years at this low rate of interest. Certainly this is not true if the interest rate remains at 2½ percent. As the bill now stands local governments could get 50-year loans for the construction of streets, sidewalks, bridges, sewer and water systems, at an interest rate of 2½ percent. Many of these facilities would be worn out and perhaps replaced before the 50-year loans have matured. To make the situation worse, the interest charges over such a long period of time would make such loans very expensive. The Illinois Constitution set a limit of 20 years on bond issues to prevent local communities from burdening themselves with debts beyond the life of public improvement. It is my feeling, therefore, there are at least three things wrong with this bill. The interest rate is too low, the period of the maturity is too long, and it adds \$2 billion to our public debt.

If we believe in the free enterprise system—and many voices are raised in support of it today—it seems to me that in this sort of program we have a good opportunity to decide whether we are giving lip service to free enterprise, or perhaps unintentionally heading for its destruction. This bill, as discussed in the committee, was promoted as a pump-priming project, and was supposed to provide many jobs as an antidote for the recession. Inasmuch as the jobs provided in this bill would probably not materialize for 18 months, it is certainly the wish of everyone that the recession will have been long left behind us before that time arrives.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a great many American citizens have a deep interest in this bill. It is not a handout bill; it is not a make-work bill. It authorizes the Community Facilities Administration to purchase obligations of cities and other political subdivisions of States, which are of such sound value or

so secured as to reasonably assure repayment. The Treasury may hold these obligations as an asset. There is not a dollar of grants in the bill. The bill certainly should not be the subject of derision.

Mr. Speaker, the need for public works, particularly in the small cities of the United States and the rural areas, is so apparent it needs no argument to support it. In almost all the States, you will find little cities that are without sufficient waterworks, without decent sewers. They are not only a menace to themselves but a menace to all the people. They throw the raw sewage into the rivers of the country, and out of it comes the water which the people must use. I imagine if foreign nations would come here and ask for help in regard to cities which are in the condition that some of ours are in, we would not lend them money, but we would make grants to them. This bill would simply lend money to our own communities. And, what is the character of the security we will get? It is an obligation of American municipalities, of American citizens to their own Government. Is that a hazardous investment? Have you ever heard of a city government going into bankruptcy? Have you ever heard of a subdivision not being able to pay the debts it is obligated to pay? Very seldom do you see any default in this character of obligation. You will not see any default here, and it will not be a throw-away or a make-work program for which we spend our money recklessly. Every dollar that is spent will be used for the benefit of the municipalities and the rural areas of America. Do not go back home and tell your people that you voted against this rule. All we ask is that the House shall function. We do not bind you on anything. We asked for an open rule, a rule that makes every amendment germane. Why do you not grant that? Why will you not consider this bill? If you vote down the rule it is a declaration that you do not want to consider legislation that has come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency and out of the Committee on Rules of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is chairman. This bill, at its conclusion, may be an entirely different bill than is now presented to the House.

Every dollar expended will have to be appropriated, not taken from the Treasury as a public debt transaction. It will be investigated and hearings held and the Committee on Appropriations will have to approve every dollar of it.

I have been authorized by the Committee on Banking and Currency to offer an amendment to that effect. It will be offered as an amendment of the committee. I also understand that an amendment will be offered to cut the amount from \$2 billion to \$500 million. I say that because I am anxious to obtain a rule for the consideration of the bill that will meet some of the objections of the gentlemen on this side of the aisle. I also would accept an amendment that would adopt the interest rate formula of the Senate bill. I cannot say that as chairman of the committee, but personally I would accept an amendment

that would adopt the formula of the Senate bill which makes the rate $3\frac{3}{8}$ percent at the present time.

We are not going into the field of private enterprise. We are trying to do something for the people who cannot do it for themselves. The big fellow always has an advantage. He has established credit. He can float his bonds in the market. The public is familiar with his financial standing. But the little communities do not have that preferential position.

I know that if you pass this bill it will meet the approval of the small towns and make life in those towns and in the rural areas happier, better than it is. Small water companies can be organized in rural areas. They would furnish water to the farmer for use in his home and for the cultivation of his crops. It will make his life pleasanter. It will give him a better means of earning a living. And we have to keep the farmer on the farm if we want to be fed.

It has been argued that this bill is not needed because our cities and towns can obtain financial aid for needed public works from the private bond market. While this might be true to some extent in the case of general obligations, which are backed by the full faith and credit of the city which issues them, it is not true of revenue bonds. Our local communities, particularly our smaller towns, simply cannot market revenue bonds at a rate they can afford to pay. At the same time they are forced by constitutional limits of various kinds to turn to revenue bonds to finance needed projects. I have asked the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for a list of States which impose such limitations. This list follows:

I. States which impose constitutional limitations on amount of municipal indebtedness: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

II. States which impose constitutional limitations on expenditures (principally, restrictions on the lending of public moneys to private business): Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming.

III. States which impose constitutional limitations on municipal tax rates: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly ask the Members of the House to vote for the rule providing for consideration of the bill. Do not register your opinion that the House ought not to consider a bill of this character under an open rule, where every amendment that is germane will be considered.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel rather humble in taking issue with our beloved chairman, for whom I have a most profound respect. However, there are some points with which I am in emphatic disagreement.

I maintain that no amendments such as have been suggested can possibly make this a palatable bill. There is much more to it and much more bad to it that cannot be corrected by the amendments mentioned if they are adopted.

First of all, the need for these improvements, for this work, has not been shown. It was not shown before the committee.

Second, the chairman has mentioned that there is a great need in small communities. May I suggest that our present law is couched in terms especially for small communities. If we adopt this gigantic thing with all of its all-inclusive measures and projects it will naturally work in favor of the big communities. The only limitation is that not more than 10 percent may be appropriated or allotted to any State. That, of course, will immediately set up a competition among the States for a ride on the bandwagon. That is dangerous, in my judgment.

This bill has been presented to you and was presented to the Senate and then passed as an antirecessionary measure. It is not and cannot be so regarded. Ninety-nine percent of the beneficiaries of this measure would be the construction industry, which does not under any circumstances need help now. There is no unemployment there. It is overloaded. I had another report this morning that we are going into a housing boom. We will jump from a million housing starts probably to 1,200,000, almost the record, this very year.

This is a highly inflationary measure. The little man as you know will be paying for these projects. He does not pay taxes in all cases. All the taxes are presently used for the existing Government needs. All of this will have to be financed by the issuance of bonds, by borrowed money, and that means inflation. And who pays for the inflation? The little man and the housewife and they pay for it in their increased cost of living at the store cash register. It is highly inflationary, and disastrous to people on fixed incomes and small incomes.

This also is an unnecessary Federal spending. It will not make any more jobs under Federal spending than under private spending, because we have shown and it could easily be shown that there is plenty of private money for these projects. It would simply divert private financing into Federal financing and make no more jobs.

No city can possibly see its way clear to do its own financing in the face of a bargain financing of this kind.

I hope this rule will be voted down. In my judgment, this bill is about the worst measure to be offered to us at this session.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to authorize the legalized robbery of future taxpayers.

How many of the proponents of this legislation would be willing to vote for a \$2 billion tax increase to pay the cost of the bill. You and I know that there is not one of the advocates who would be willing to do so. Yet, we all know that this legislation can be financed only with further borrowing by the United States Treasury; borrowing at an interest rate in excess of the rate available in the market to municipalities.

If we are unwilling to pay the bill ourselves, how can we be so willing to impose the burden of paying for it on future taxpayers?

The day before yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee reported legislation to increase the permanent debt limit by \$10 billion. In view of the expenditures already authorized by this Congress and the state of the Treasury, the committee had no alternative.

Mr. Speaker, if the House approves this legislation, the debt limit bill will be obsolete before it is even considered by the Congress.

Our people can well ask, "Has this Congress gone crazy?" If we vote for this bill, the answer will certainly be, "Yes."

This bill is legalized robbery.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there was no practical need for this bill demonstrated to our committee. All it amounts to is a transfer of projects from private financing to Government financing. No evidence was shown of projects halted by inability to finance. Under this program, financing costs would average out at 2½ percent so that the Government would be subsidizing every loan because of its borrowing cost and administration cost by about three-fourths of 1 percent.

I believe it is a fraud to say that this would provide great employment. It would provide the same employment involved in financing any of these projects through private financing.

It covers the waterfront. It is a grab-bag. The only public facility of any kind that would be excluded would be schools and certainly schools are the most vitally needed public facilities.

In committee, efforts were made to narrow the scope of this bill to include what might be considered urgent needs, such as water, sewage, and garbage disposal, sanitary facilities, streets and bridges. These efforts were defeated. I myself offered an amendment which would change the word "include" on page 16, line 19, in the definition of public facility to "mean." This would have meant that at least the scope of the bill would be limited to the named 25 or more public facility purposes designated in the definition. This amendment was defeated as too restrictive. In other words, the sponsors of this bill would provide moneys for any conceivable type of pet project, and I do mean "pet," as it could include doghouses, thought up by the governing body.

What has amazed me is that in a bill characterized as one of the greatest steps toward alleviation of unemployment, there should be a lack of labor interest. This can best be understood when I tell you that a prominent labor leader told me just recently "We have analyzed the bill and found no additional jobs in it."

I hope that all Members will read the vigorous minority views submitted in the committee report.

When you vote on the increase in the national debt next week remember passage of this bill will take \$2 billion of it. Let us leave the exploration of space to the explorers. Let us quit trying to put the national debt into orbit. Vote down the rule on this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the arguments against voting for the rule on this bill have largely ignored the fact that the mayors of this Nation appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in behalf of this bill. They pointed out to us that they had extended themselves to the limit on their debt limit. They cannot borrow in other places. This bill would finance needed projects. In my judgment, the best testimony before the committee was the testimony of the mayor of the city of Detroit, Louis Miriani, who pointed out that unemployment at the present time in the city of Detroit is 18 percent, with the worst 60 days yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would generate some employment and it would give the city of Detroit as well as other cities and towns needed assistance. The income of the Government is generated from the income of its people. The State of Michigan is the second highest taxpayer in the Nation. It is now hard-hit with an overall unemployment figure of approximately 15 percent. You will have to increase the debt limit even further unless the State of Michigan can be aided in its present circumstances. This bill would help the cities and towns of Michigan, as well as other States.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this rule and the passage of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. Speaker, there is hardly a city or town in the United States that does not have some down at the heels community facilities that are both an eyesore and a deterioration in the essential services for those who live and work in the locality. Community officials are aware of the need, but they can do nothing about it.

The bulk of the projects that must be constructed cannot be financed in the private market at interest rates which the communities cannot afford or cannot support on an economic basis.

For years these projects have been deferred or postponed.

Unless a liberalized financing program is adopted to break this logjam, these pressures, in some instances, may lead to a paralysis of municipal services.

S. 3497, as amended by the House Committee on Banking and Currency is designed to provide a much needed stimulus to our lagging economy, to increase the flow of the purchasing power into the hands of the consumer, and to reduce the alarming ranks of the unemployed. Basically, the bill would provide a substantial sum of money for long-term loans on liberal terms to municipalities and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of many types of worthy community facilities and public works. Your committee is convinced that the program will furnish a vitally needed economic stimulus and at the same time will enable communities to build essential and desirable public facilities which would not otherwise go forward.

This is not merely a current need that could change with the economic winds. Behind it is the neglect of years.

Our towns and cities, and States, also, have fallen behind in their struggle to provide the community facilities and public works which our country needs. Under the proposed program, every structure and facility will serve a useful purpose and the network of such essential community facilities will contribute to national health, safety, convenience, and progress.

The present community facilities loan program was authorized by the Housing amendments of 1955. Loans under the present program have been confined almost entirely to water and sewage facility loans. Only political subdivisions of 10,000 inhabitants or less, could qualify.

The administration recognized the severe and impractical limitations of this program in March of 1958, by extending eligibility to all types of projects except schools, and to communities of up to 50,000 population.

This still falls far short of the need. S. 3497 is broad in scope, and will permit loans for the construction, repair and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports and other public transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers and public nursing homes and public convalescent homes; public refuse and garbage-disposal facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; civil-defense facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public wholesale farm produce markets; public libraries and offices and other public buildings—other than schools; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

Loans to nonprofit hospitals to finance specific projects for hospital construction, repair, or improvement are also made eligible under the bill.

Loan funds for school construction were deliberately left out of this bill because the community facilities loan program is not the proper vehicle for an attack on the school construction program. The school problem is one of such major proportions that it must be considered

separately and on its own merits exclusively.

Applications of communities which demonstrate that the project involved could not be undertaken without Federal assistance would be processed ahead of applications where such a showing is not made.

In order to encourage the widest possible participation of local government in the community facilities and public-works program contemplated by this bill, the committee recommends that the interest rate to borrowers should be kept at the lowest practicable level. Most branches of local government are in difficult financial straits. Their financial burden will increase further unless economic recovery can be achieved.

The bill would provide a fund of \$2 billion for loans to eligible projects. Of this sum, \$400 million would constitute a revolving fund. Provision is made to permit proceeds of loans extended under the old program of the 1955 act to go into the \$400-million revolving fund. The committee believes that the \$2-billion fund provided is the minimum amount required to meet the need for an expanded community-facilities and public-works program.

A borrowing municipality could specify a loan maturity of 50 years, or a lesser period, if it chooses; in any case, that which is best suited to its financial requirements.

There is adequate precedent for this type of legislation.

Experience under previous Federal loan programs clearly demonstrate the soundness of these investments.

Under this bill, the city of Boston would be able to borrow money to build a new city hall.

However, as the House version does not authorize the extension of assistance to the States, it would be of no assistance to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in financing essential State projects. As it passed in the Senate, the States would be permitted to borrow for State projects. I hope that this will be sustained when the bill clears the Senate-House conference committee.

S. 3497 will bring community facilities up to date and will make a significant contribution to the economic recovery of the Nation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, in the very little time remaining I could not begin to say what should be said about this bill. But I must say this: That on a piece of legislation such as this, which is of special concern to over 5 million and closer to 6 million unemployed men and women in America, a bill that affects over 16,000 of our municipalities and 17,000 townships and about 3,049 counties, certainly a bill of this importance should be discussed and heard out. It is amazing to me, and I am astounded that the leadership from across the aisle comes on the floor of the House and says there is no need for this bill. Obviously, they have not read the report of the special assistant to their President, for public works, under date of July 1957,

scarcely a year ago, here is what he said: That in almost every category of public works, dire shortages have arisen.

Then there is a detailed breakdown, giving the needs and showing what should be done. Here is the adviser on public works to the President at the White House who states that in the next 10 years for State and municipal projects, there will be a need for over \$204 billion, or over \$20 billion a year. Deducting what you have appropriated and authorized for highways and for education and hospitals, in all of these things we are still lagging and way behind; building only one-third of the hospitals that should be built and all the way down the line on other public facilities. I say let us at least discuss this problem for the 3 hours provided by this rule. There is as much prosperity in northern Minnesota and Detroit and in northern Michigan as there is peace in the Middle East. I appeal to you to vote for the rule and give us an opportunity to hear the full story on the need for this legislation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

WHAT DO MINNEAPOLIS PEOPLE THINK ON MAJOR ISSUES?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in recent years I have prepared and sent annually to each resident of my Congressional District whose name was listed in the telephone directory a questionnaire dealing with some of the major controversial issues facing the Congress and the Nation. This year slightly more than 11,000 persons filled out and returned the questionnaire—a substantial increase from the total of 8,708 who did so in 1957.

There are two main problems in getting out such a questionnaire. One is the impossibility of framing a question on an involved issue in such a form that a "yes" or "no" answer can begin to reflect accurately or adequately an individual's views on the matter. As an engineer wrote, "Much more would be revealed if the answer column provided for degree of concern or interest—such as: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree." This certainly is true, but I found it would make the questionnaire and its analysis too detailed to be feasible. While "yes" and "no" answers admittedly cannot be complete, they are still very helpful. At least the general trends in thinking are clearly revealed. Also, a constituent who answers must put himself in the position of his Congressman who has to vote "yes" or "no" on a complicated bill, even though he may favor some provisions of it and oppose others. A student wrote:

I found it stimulating to examine my position and take a "yes" or "no" stand on these issues.

The other problem is how to get the widest sampling of voter opinion. Using the telephone directory does not reach all the voters, especially those in lower economic levels, and in households where many use a telephone listed in the

name of only one of them. One person wrote, "Are you not risking the ire of the women by not addressing a communication like this to Mr. and Mrs. and sending duplicates so both can express an opinion?" Perhaps so, but it is impossible for me to determine how many people there are in each home in my district, and to send to that address a questionnaire for each adult. Some have solved this difficulty by having the husband make a red checkmark and the wife a blue checkmark on the same questionnaire; or one person checks with pencil and the other with pen. Thus one questionnaire can give me the views of two people—or as many as there are colored pencils.

With all its shortcomings, it has seemed the only practicable plan is to engage a mailing service to address a questionnaire to each name in the telephone directory with an address in the Fifth Congressional District. Regrettably, this means that sometimes questionnaires are addressed to persons no longer living.

Approximately half of those who returned their questionnaires indicated that they considered themselves Republicans. It was gratifying that more members of the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party (DFL)—12.6 percent of the total replies—responded than last year—8 percent of the total—because that gives a larger and more reliable sample of the thinking among the members of that party.

The percentage of Independents replying remains fairly constant—approximately 30 percent each year. The number of replies from persons who indicated no party affiliation or preference increased to 8 percent this year from 3 percent in 1956.

Approximately one-third of all who replied added comments on the individual questions listed, or on other subjects in which they were interested, or on general political philosophy. The additional comments ranged from a crisp phrase or sentence to 10-page letters. Many commented on the questionnaire itself:

Your questionnaire interested me immensely, made me realize how little I know of world and United States problems—so I got busy and did some reading.

Just reflecting on these questions before putting down the check mark serves well to emphasize the complexity of your job.

You Congressmen have a hard job making the decisions to please everyone. All you can do is your best for the country as a whole.

It is encouraging to know that a Congressman is interested in the voters' opinion. I hope, however, that the statistical results are not used as a substitute for good judgment.

Most of those signing this questionnaire are not really informed on the issues—myself included. We only know what we see in the papers.

Many comments show a good deal of humor. One lady wrote at the top of her questionnaire:

Send out more of these and read the answers out loud to the President.

And at the bottom:

You probably won't like my answers, but you asked the questions.

Another left all the answers blank and wrote across the top:

Will you please check the answer which most nearly represents your view and I'll look it over and return it to you by airmail.

There were poignant replies from persons who have come only recently to the United States. For example:

We just came over from Germany and we don't know much about all this yet. Please be kindly and try to understand that we can't fill out this paper before we found out more all about it.

Such an answer reminds one sharply how great and often unappreciated a blessing is the simple right in America of every citizen to answer as he wishes or to disregard entirely any communication from a Government official elected by the people themselves. The people are the boss here, not the Government.

The tabulated replies appended below speak for themselves. But perhaps it is worth while to call attention to a few, especially if the same general question was asked in previous years and the replies this year show a significant shift in opinion.

Eighty-two and seven-tenths percent of all replies indicate approval of the job the United Nations is doing in handling world problems. This is a marked increase from the 59 percent expressing such approval in 1956, and tells its own story.

There is approximately the same overall support—79.7 percent—as last year for continued United States assistance to other countries in the struggle against Communist aggression and subversion. Members of the Republican Party, which has for many years been considered isolationist, show a slightly higher percentage (85.3 percent) of approval of our so-called foreign aid program than do members of the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party (81.8 percent). This higher support among Republicans has been true each of the last 3 years.

The first significant difference in views between persons of different political leanings appeared with the first question on domestic issues, "Should Congress raise taxes to meet any deficit in the Federal budget this year rather than have an unbalanced budget?" The strongest support for increased taxes under such circumstances was from Republicans—35.1 percent—and the least from DFL's—22 percent. When one recalls that most of the questionnaires were filled out about March 1 of this year when unemployment and the talk of possible severe depression were at or near their height, it is revealing to note that so many favored a tax increase rather than an unbalanced budget. In a similar vein were comments like:

I would have preferred to vote "yes" on several questions, but they seem out of the question with our unbalanced budget.

Almost exactly the same percentage—54.9 percent—favored an increase in social-security benefits this year as last year, even though the question this year specifically mentioned that an increase in benefits would require a corresponding increase in payroll deductions.

Eighty and one-tenth percent this year, as against 56.4 percent last year,

favored increasing to \$1,800 the present limitation of \$1,200 which a retired person receiving social-security benefits can earn without losing those benefits. As I have been sponsoring a bill to make such an increase, I appreciated this significant change. It plainly pictures the increased difficulties retired people are having.

Substantially more people—69 percent—favored an extension to more workers of coverage under the minimum-wage law than favored an increase—44.3 percent—in the present \$1 hourly rate to the workers already covered.

Nearly two-thirds of all replies expressed a belief that present labor laws do not give union members adequate democratic control over their union. While Republicans and Independents felt the strongest in this regard, a majority of Democrat-Farmer-Laborites expressing an opinion took the same position. Many added comments such as:

Members' opinions are not adequately considered.

I am a union member, but a few racketeers have harmed the cause of labor. Unions should be cleaned up by the members themselves.

A strong majority—64.6 percent—from all groups favored salary increases for postal and other governmental employees, but quite a few added that they approved salary increases for postal workers more than for civil service employees.

An overwhelming percentage—78.3 percent—opposed providing greater financial assistance to farmers. Even in the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party a substantial majority—58.5 percent—opposed such increased assistance.

Two-thirds now oppose Federal payments for the Soil Bank program as contrasted with a majority favoring in 1956—a significant shift. Comments were added like:

Subsidies are unhealthy.
Let farmer run own business—low-cost loans, if needed.

While a majority of the 88.1 percent who expressed an opinion favored increasing benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities, an overwhelming majority—4½ to 1—opposed increasing the benefits to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

Each year in my questionnaire I have asked the people of my district to indicate, in the order of their importance, the five issues which cause them greatest concern today out of a list of 16 issues, largely domestic, on which Congress is being requested to legislate. This year I included three new issues in the list: Rising cost of living, because of the renewed upward march of prices after being held stable for more than 4 years; unemployment, because of its sharp rise within the last year; and deficiencies in education, because of widespread discussion of that subject following the Russian sputniks and other scientific achievements. A good many wrote that I should also have included other issues which are causing them special concern, such as, in their words:

Union monopolies.
Atom bomb testing.

Inflation.
Corruption in unions.
Farm subsidies.
Political hypocrisy.
Juvenile delinquency.

Rising cost of living was strongly the first choice as the most disturbing domestic issue, moving national defense to second place after having been first in 1956 and 1957. Unemployment took third place, moving communism in Government to fourth.

A very marked shift was the moving up of cost of medical care from 13th in 1956 and 9th in 1957 to 6th in 1958.

An equally marked shift, but in the opposite direction, was the decline in importance of Federal aid for school construction from 7th place in 1956, and 11th in 1957, to last—16th—place this year. Probably this reflects the large amount of school construction that has been accomplished by local agencies out of local resources during the last few years. The classroom shortages are fewer and thus not so acutely felt as in previous years.

At the same time, deficiency in education was ranked seventh. These two results taken together would seem to indicate that our people are presently less concerned over the number of classrooms for their children than they are over the character and quality of the instruction being provided in them.

Perhaps as a result of the McClellan committee hearings, labor-management relations moved up to 8th from a ranking of 12th last year.

The most spectacular shift took place in the three issues directly relating to the fiscal policies of the Federal Government: reduction of taxes, reduction of budget, and reduction of the national debt. Whereas last year these 3 were ranked respectively 3d, 4th, and 5th, they slipped this year to 10th, 13th, and 14th. Probably this does not mean that people are less desirous than formerly of having their taxes and the Federal budget and the national debt reduced; but rather that, as always in times of emergency, whether it be domestic unemployment or recognition of international dangers requiring greater expenditures for new weapons, most Americans regard these emergency issues of greater urgency.

Despite the talk about a widespread revolt in the Midwest because of low farm prices, nothing of that sort is indicated in the replies. Low farm prices was ranked 9th in 1956, 14th in 1957, and 15th in 1958. Perhaps this merely reflects the fact that the Fifth District is entirely urban, although its people realize that their well-being depends to a great extent on prosperity in agriculture. Or it may mean that the farmers of Minnesota are not undergoing such a depression as has been alleged.

The civil rights issue dropped from 6th place last year to 12th this year. This marked decline was shown in the replies from people of all political faiths, the most extreme being the decline among DFL's from 2d place in 1957 to 10th in 1958. Many added comments like—

Believe should let this simmer for a while—

Or—

Must take time for public to adjust to Supreme Court decisions—

Or—

Can't legislate, must educate.

The two issues on which the largest percentage of people recorded their opinions were whether to increase the \$1,200 limitation on earnings by retired persons receiving social security benefits—96.9 percent of the replies—and whether to increase taxes if necessary to avoid a larger budget deficit—95 percent. This high incidence of definite opinions on these two issues points up the fact that social security and taxes affect directly almost all citizens.

It was instructive to observe that the subject on which people most frequently commented was some phase of the difficulties being experienced by elderly people. They now live 10 or more years longer than formerly and require more medical care in their declining years. They have less income, and inflation has reduced by more than 50 percent the purchasing power of their savings or their pensions or social security benefits. Few jobs are available to them if they try to go back to work. Among the 16 domestic issues listed in question 23, "Provision for elderly people," was ranked 9th by all the people who replied. But the added comments of those who are in the aging group reveal that their problems seem so nearly insoluble to them as to cause a feeling of almost fear of the future and helplessness.

The second most common subject on which persons wrote additional comments was the proposed increase in postal rates. Hundreds took the trouble to write that they thought "junk mail" ought to be abolished, or at least that the rates on third-class mail ought to be increased more sharply than the rates on first-class mail. Many wrote that rates were also not high enough on second-class mail, magazines, and so forth.

A study of the replies suggests a few general observations. For example, it is striking that there is no substantial difference in the views of DFL's, Republicans, and Independents on the first seven questions which deal with various foreign policy problems. This seems to demonstrate that the maxim, "Politics stops at the water's edge," still prevails in this country and is one of the greatest guaranties that the country will continue strong and united in its dealings with other countries.

On domestic matters, however, there were sharp differences—with Independents truly in the middle of the road. The Independents showed a slightly closer correspondence to Republicans on those issues where there was the widest difference between Democrat-Farmer-Laborites and Republicans. Independents were closer to the GOP position on 14 of the 22 major questions and closer to the DFL position on 7, with 1 even.

Those who did not list themselves as DFL, Republican, or Independent were closer to the Republicans on 19 issues and closer to the DFL's on 3. This no-party group registered significantly less support than any of the other groups for the United Nations, a U. N. police force, foreign aid, reciprocal trade, exchange of

scientific information with allies, and increased travel and cultural relations with the Soviet Union.

Sometimes it is said that there is little or no difference between the two political parties when it comes to the views of their members on specific issues. The replies to this questionnaire do not support that statement. While there is practically no difference between DFL's, Republicans, and Independents on foreign policy matters, there is a definite and consistent difference between the two parties on domestic issues. The DFL's show more support and the Republicans show less support for spending by the Federal Government for the various aid programs to States, local communities, and individuals. That is, Republicans tend to depend more on themselves and local agencies than on the Federal Government, whereas the DFL's look more to the Federal Government.

One may ask which is cause and which is effect. Are people's views influenced substantially by the positions of the political party to which they belong? Or do they join the political party whose position corresponds most closely with their own views? Or both?

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the replies to my questionnaire raise as many questions as they answer. But the replies below are informative, thought-provoking, and worthy of careful study:

Opinion survey—5th Congressional District, Minneapolis, Minn., 1958

	Number of replies	Percent of total
Do you consider yourself:		
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	1,392	12.6
Republican.....	5,308	48.3
Independent.....	3,279	29.8
Not indicated.....	1,033	9.3
Total.....	11,012	100.0

FOREIGN POLICY

1. In general, do you believe the United Nations is doing the kind of job in handling world problems that justifies its continued support by the United States?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	82.7	11.5	5.8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	83.5	13.3	3.2
Republican.....	82.9	10.6	6.5
Independent.....	83.8	11.9	4.3
Not indicated.....	76.7	13.3	10.0

2. Do you favor efforts to develop a permanent United Nations police force similar to the temporary force now patrolling the Israeli-Egyptian border?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	76.7	15.8	7.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	78.0	16.0	6.0
Republican.....	75.9	16.4	7.7
Independent.....	79.9	14.4	5.7
Not indicated.....	69.5	18.4	12.1

3. In general, do you favor continued United States assistance to other countries in the free world's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	79.7	11.9	8.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	81.8	14.5	3.7
Republican.....	85.3	9.5	5.2
Independent.....	80.5	13.4	6.1
Not indicated.....	46.1	15.7	38.2

**Opinion survey—5th Congressional District,
Minneapolis, Minn., 1958—Continued**

4. Do you believe Congress should extend the reciprocal trade program of negotiating agreements with other countries to lower world tariffs as a means of expanding our world trade?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	81.4	8.3	10.3
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	82.0	10.4	7.6
Republican.....	80.9	8.9	10.2
Independent.....	83.7	8.5	7.8
Not indicated.....	76.3	10.3	13.4

5. Do you believe Congress should authorize our Government to exchange scientific information on atomic weapons and guided missiles with our allies?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	61.2	30.9	7.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	59.3	34.4	6.3
Republican.....	61.9	30.7	7.4
Independent.....	63.2	28.3	8.5
Not indicated.....	54.9	33.8	11.3

6. Do you favor closer United States cooperation with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries in political and economic fields in addition to the military alliance?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	75.5	13.7	10.8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	76.8	13.3	9.9
Republican.....	75.9	13.4	10.7
Independent.....	75.9	14.9	9.2
Not indicated.....	69.9	13.1	17.0

7. Do you favor increased travel and cultural relations with the Soviet Union?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	68.9	24.2	6.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	70.6	25.1	4.3
Republican.....	66.3	26.5	7.2
Independent.....	73.9	19.8	6.3
Not indicated.....	65.4	24.1	10.5

DOMESTIC POLICY

8. If Federal expenditures should exceed revenues this year, do you believe Congress should raise taxes to meet the deficit rather than have an unbalanced budget?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	32.0	63.1	4.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	22.0	73.9	4.1
Republican.....	35.1	62.5	2.2
Independent.....	31.7	60.9	7.4
Not indicated.....	30.4	57.9	11.7

9. Do you favor increasing the present social-security taxes paid by employees and employers in order to pay larger benefits?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	54.9	39.8	5.3
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	73.0	23.5	3.5
Republican.....	46.7	47.5	5.8
Independent.....	59.2	36.2	4.6
Not indicated.....	58.6	33.6	7.8

10. Do you think Congress should increase to at least \$1,800 the present limitation of \$1,200 which a retired person receiving social-security benefits can earn without losing those benefits?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	80.1	16.8	3.1
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	84.4	13.9	1.7
Republican.....	78.7	17.9	3.4
Independent.....	81.5	15.8	2.7
Not indicated.....	77.6	17.8	4.6

**Opinion survey—5th Congressional District,
Minneapolis, Minn., 1958—Continued**

11. Do you favor amending the present Federal minimum-wage law to:

	Yes	No	No opinion
(a) Raise the present \$1 hourly rate?			
All.....	44.3	45.7	10.0
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	74.4	20.1	5.5
Republican.....	32.3	56.9	10.8
Independent.....	50.8	40.5	8.7
Not indicated.....	44.8	38.8	16.4
(b) Extend coverage to more workers?			
All.....	69.0	19.5	11.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	87.9	6.3	5.8
Republican.....	60.6	25.9	13.5
Independent.....	75.9	14.6	9.5
Not indicated.....	66.2	18.3	15.5

12. In general, do you believe our present labor laws give union members adequate democratic control over the policies and decisions of their unions?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	26.8	63.4	9.8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	41.5	48.6	9.9
Republican.....	22.1	68.8	9.1
Independent.....	27.7	63.7	8.6
Not indicated.....	27.9	55.5	16.6

13. Do you believe Congress should raise the salaries of postal and other Government employees?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	64.6	25.7	9.7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	76.6	18.4	5.0
Republican.....	59.7	29.4	10.9
Independent.....	68.5	22.9	8.6
Not indicated.....	61.3	25.7	13.0

14. Do you believe Congress should raise postal rates to reduce the annual post-office deficit?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	76.8	17.9	5.3
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	74.6	21.8	3.6
Republican.....	76.7	17.8	5.5
Independent.....	70.9	15.7	4.4
Not indicated.....	71.6	20.2	8.2

15. Do you favor establishment of scholarships by the Federal Government to expand the training of scientists?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	62.8	30.6	6.6
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	74.9	20.7	4.4
Republican.....	58.8	34.6	6.6
Independent.....	63.8	30.2	6.0
Not indicated.....	63.4	25.1	11.5

16. Do you favor legislation this year to provide grants by the Federal Government to assist States and local communities in the construction of schools?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	54.6	39.1	6.3
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	76.0	19.0	5.0
Republican.....	46.2	47.6	6.2
Independent.....	59.4	35.0	5.6
Not indicated.....	53.1	36.4	10.5

17. In general, do you believe Congress should provide greater financial assistance to farmers than they are now receiving?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	14.3	78.3	7.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	34.2	58.5	7.3
Republican.....	8.1	85.7	6.2
Independent.....	15.0	77.1	7.9
Not indicated.....	17.1	70.5	12.4

**Opinion survey—5th Congressional District,
Minneapolis, Minn., 1958—Continued**

18. Do you favor direct Government payments to farmers who take land out of production (Soil Bank) as a means of soil conservation and reduction of surpluses?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	24.4	66.7	8.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	29.2	62.5	8.3
Republican.....	24.6	67.3	8.1
Independent.....	22.6	69.2	8.2
Not indicated.....	23.1	62.3	14.6

19. During the past several decades Congress has instituted Federal grants on a matching basis to stimulate and assist States and local communities with various projects. Do you believe the Federal Government should now reduce its contributions to the following such programs?

	Yes	No	No opinion
(a) Vocational education:			
All.....	40.4	51.2	8.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	29.5	64.6	5.9
Republican.....	45.5	45.3	9.2
Independent.....	37.1	55.9	7.0
Not indicated.....	39.9	46.9	13.2
(b) Hospital construction:			
All.....	36.8	55.9	7.3
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	29.5	65.0	5.5
Republican.....	40.5	51.9	7.6
Independent.....	34.4	59.9	5.7
Not indicated.....	36.0	51.4	12.6
(c) Slum clearance:			
All.....	35.8	60.0	4.2
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	26.3	70.4	3.3
Republican.....	42.2	55.7	2.1
Independent.....	29.8	64.9	5.3
Not indicated.....	34.4	53.5	12.1
(d) Stream-pollution control:			
All.....	30.8	60.5	8.7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	26.5	67.8	5.7
Republican.....	33.5	57.1	9.4
Independent.....	27.9	65.3	6.8
Not indicated.....	31.8	53.4	14.8

20. Do you believe Congress should increase benefits for:

	Yes	No	No opinion
(a) Veterans with service-connected disabilities?			
All.....	47.8	40.3	11.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	62.9	27.4	9.7
Republican.....	44.9	44.6	10.5
Independent.....	48.6	41.2	10.2
Not indicated.....	39.9	33.7	26.4
(b) Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities?			
All.....	15.4	72.9	11.7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	27.4	61.1	11.5
Republican.....	12.5	77.8	9.7
Independent.....	15.1	75.4	9.5
Not indicated.....	14.7	56.2	29.1

21. Do you believe Congress should pass at this session additional legislation in the field of civil rights?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	31.1	52.1	16.8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	44.8	38.8	16.4
Republican.....	27.9	56.9	15.2
Independent.....	31.9	54.1	14.0
Not indicated.....	25.9	39.2	34.9

22. Do you favor a system of pay television?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	7.5	82.1	10.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	6.3	85.7	8.0
Republican.....	7.1	83.2	9.7
Independent.....	8.6	83.6	7.8
Not indicated.....	7.0	67.7	25.3

Opinion survey—5th Congressional District, Minneapolis, Minn.—Continued

23. Please number (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) in order of their importance, the 5 domestic issues which cause you greatest concern today:

	All	Democrat-Farmer-Labor	Republican	Independent	Not indicated
Rising cost of living.....	21,850	3,228	9,873	7,147	1,602
National defense.....	18,786	2,036	9,907	5,588	1,255
Unemployment.....	13,600	2,928	6,642	4,979	1,051
Communist influence in United States.....	11,259	988	6,721	2,883	867
Corruption in Government.....	9,881	1,069	4,757	3,243	812
Cost of medical care.....	9,448	1,587	3,839	3,206	816
Deficiencies in education.....	8,666	1,008	3,952	3,122	584
Labor-management relations.....	8,162	563	5,029	1,935	635
Provision for elderly people.....	8,085	1,327	3,569	2,484	705
Reducing taxes.....	8,063	1,093	4,080	2,256	634
Federal bureaucracy.....	7,575	287	4,656	2,023	609
Civil rights.....	6,428	925	2,763	2,213	527
Reducing the Federal budget.....	5,920	289	3,705	1,492	434
Reducing the national debt.....	5,342	292	3,383	1,343	324
Low farm prices.....	3,276	740	1,238	1,044	254
School construction.....	3,253	592	1,337	1,070	254

NOTE.—Above ratings arrived at by figuring 5 points for issue numbered 1, 4 points for issue numbered 2, 3 points for those numbered 3, 2 points for those numbered 4, and 1 point for those numbered 5.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 187, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—173

Abernethy Garmatz O'Hara, Ill.
 Addonizio Gathings O'Konski
 Albert Granahan O'Neill
 Anderson, Grant Patman
 Mont, Gray Perkins
 Andrews Green, Oreg. Pfost
 Ashley Green, Pa. Philbin
 Aspinall Gregory Polk
 Bailey Griffiths Porter
 Baldwin Hagen Price
 Barrett Harris Rabaut
 Beckworth Hays, Ohio Reuss
 Bennett, Fla. Healey Rhodes, Pa.
 Bennett, Mich. Hollifield Rivers
 Blatnik Holland Roberts
 Boland Holtzman Rodino
 Boyle Huddleston Rogers, Colo.
 Bray Jarman Rogers, Tex.
 Breeding Jennings Rooney
 Brooks, Tex. Johnson Roosevelt
 Brown, Ga. Jones, Ala. Ruthertford
 Brown, Mo. Karsten Santangelo
 Byrd Kee Saund
 Byrne, Pa. Kelly, N. Y. Saylor
 Canfield Kilday Scott, Pa.
 Carrigg King Seely-Brown
 Chamberlain Kirwan Selden
 Chelf Kluczynski Shelley
 Clark Knutson Sheppard
 Coad Lane Sikes
 Coffin Lankford Siler
 Colmer Libonati Sisk
 Cooley McCormack Smith, Miss.
 Curtin McFall Spence
 Davis, Tenn. McGovern Staggers
 Dawson, Ill. McIntosh Steed
 Delaney Macdonald Sullivan
 Dellay Mack, Ill. Teague, Tex.
 Dent Madden Teller
 Denton Magnuson Thomas
 Dingell May Thompson, La.
 Doolinger Merrow Thompson, N. J.
 Donohue Metcalf Thompson, Tex.
 Doyle Mills Thornberry
 Durham Mitchell Trimble
 Dwyer Edmondson Montoya
 Elliott Moore Ullman
 Engle Morano Vanik
 Everett Morgan Van Zandt
 Evins Morrison Walter
 Fallon Moss Watts
 Fenton Multer Wier
 Flood Natcher Winstead
 Fogarty Nimtz Wright
 Forand Nix Yates
 Frazier O'Brien, Ill. Young
 Fulton O'Brien, N. Y. Zablocki

NAYS—187

Abbutt Fino Miller, Md.
 Adair Fisher Miller, Nebr.
 Alger Flynt Miller, N. Y.
 Allen, Calif. Ford Minshall
 Allen, Ill. Forrester Mumma
 Andersen, Fountain Murray
 H. Carl Frelinghuysen Neal
 Arends Gary Nicholson
 Ashmore Gavin Norblad
 Auchincloss George Norrell
 Avery Glenn O'Hara, Minn.
 Ayres Griffin Osmers
 Baker Gross Ostertag
 Bass, N. H. Gubser Pelly
 Bates Gwinn Pilcher
 Baumhart Hale Pillion
 Beamer Haley Poff
 Becker Halleck Quile
 Belcher Harden Ray
 Bentley Harrison, Nebr. Reece, Tenn.
 Berry Harrison, Va. Reed
 Betts Harvey Rees, Kans.
 Bolton Haskell Rhodes, Ariz.
 Bosch Hemphill Riehlman
 Bow Henderson Riley
 Boykin Herlong Robison, N. Y.
 Brooks, La. Heselton Robison, Ky.
 Broomefield Hess Rogers, Fla.
 Brown, Ohio Hiestand Rogers, Mass.
 Brownson Hill Schenck
 Broynhill Hoeven Schwengel
 Budge Holmes Scott, N. C.
 Burleson Holt Scudder
 Bush Horan Simpson, Ill.
 Byrne, Ill. Hosmer Simpson, Pa.
 Byrnes, Wis. Hull Smith, Calif.
 Cannon Hyde Smith, Va.
 Cederberg Jensen Springer
 Chenoweth Johansen Stauffer
 Chipperfield Jonas Taber
 Church Judd Teague, Calif.
 Clevenger Kean Tewes
 Collier Kearney Thomson, Wyo.
 Corbett Kearns Utt
 Cramer Kilburn Van Pelt
 Cretella Kilgore Vinson
 Cunningham, Kitclun Vorys
 Iowa Knox Vursell
 Cunningham, Lafore Wainwright
 Nebr. Laird Weaver
 Curtis, Mass. Latham Westland
 Curtis, Mo. LeCompte Wharton
 Dague Lennon Whitener
 Davis, Ga. Lipscomb Whitten
 Dawson, Utah McCulloch Widnall
 Dennison McDonough Wigglesworth
 Derounian McGregor Williams, Miss.
 Devereux McVey Williams, N. Y.
 Dixon Mack, Wash. Wilson, Calif.
 Dooley Mahon Wilson, Ind.
 Dorn, N. Y. Maillard Withrow
 Dorn, S. C. Martin Younger
 Dowdy Matthews
 Fascell Meador

NOT VOTING—70

Alexander Bonner Diggs
 Anfuso Buckley Eberharter
 Barden Burdick Farbstein
 Baring Carnahan Feighan
 Bass, Tenn. Celler Friedel
 Blitch Christopher Gordon
 Boggs Coudert Hardy
 Bolling Dies Hays, Ark.

Hébert
 Hillings
 Hoffman
 Ikard
 Jackson
 James
 Jenkins
 Jones, Mo.
 Keating
 Keogh
 Krueger
 Landrum
 Lesinski
 Loser
 McCarthy
 McIntire
 McMillan
 Machrowicz
 Marshall
 Mason
 Michel
 Morris
 Moulder
 Passman
 Patterson
 Poage
 Powell
 Preston
 Prouty
 Radwan
 Robeson, Va.
 Sadiak
 St. George
 Scherer
 Scrivner
 Sheehan
 Shuford
 Sieminski
 Smith, Kans.
 Talle
 Taylor
 Tollefson
 Tuck
 Willis
 Wolverton
 Zelenko

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Keating against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Sheehan against.
 Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Radwan against.
 Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Hillings against.
 Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Sadiak against.
 Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
 Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. McIntire against.
 Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Burdick against.
 Mr. Patterson for, with Mr. Coudert against.
 Mr. Ikard for, with Mr. Scherer against.
 Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Taylor against.
 Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Mason against.
 Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Jackson against.
 Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Krueger against.
 Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
 Mr. Marshall for, with Mr. Prouty against.
 Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. James against.
 Mr. Willis for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Passman with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Talle.
 Mr. Preston with Mr. Smith.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wolverton.
 Mr. Loser with Mr. Tollefson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12628) to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to extend for an additional 3-year period the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "twelve" and insert "fourteen."

Line 7, strike out "seven" and insert "nine."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CIVIL WAR RECORDS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD concerning a bill I am introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the legislative committee of the Civil War Centennial Commission, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to microfilm the military and naval records of the Civil War at a cost of not to exceed \$50,000 a year for 10 years. This bill has been introduced pursuant to a resolution of the national assembly convoked on January 14-15, 1958, by the Civil War Centennial Commission as required by Public Law 85-305. The cost estimate was obtained from the National Archives and Records Service through the following correspondence:

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1958.

Mr. ROBERT H. BAHMER,
Deputy Archivist of the United States,
National Archives and Records Service,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BAHMER: This will confirm my verbal request of yesterday for a formal estimate of the cost of microfilming the official records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Navies, War and Navy Departments, and such other official Confederate records as are not now included in the War Department collection of Confederate records in the National Archives. Any records that are of such strictly limited interest that the cost of microfilming would not be warranted should, of course, be excluded from the estimate, but it should include, if possible, any important bodies of records not in the custody of the National Archives.

The National Assembly, which met under the auspices of our Civil War Centennial Commission in Washington last January, has officially approved as a part of the national program the work of microfilming these official records. In addition, we have had many inquiries from all over the country about this matter and, therefore, we consider it a subject of the greatest importance.

I trust that you may find it convenient to provide us with the cost information as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

KARL S. BETTS,
Executive Director.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1958.

Mr. KARL S. BETTS,
Executive Director, Civil War Centennial Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: Your letter of July 15, 1958, asked for a formal estimate of the cost of microfilming the official records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Navies, War and Navy Departments, and such other official Confederate records as are not now included in the War Department collection of Confederate records in the National Archives.

We estimate that we have about 15,500 cubic feet of military and naval records of the Civil War including the War Department

collection of Confederate records. This figure does not include a nearly equal volume of compiled military service records that will be microfilmed in part in accordance with current programs.

The figure 15,500 includes about 7,000 cubic feet of regimental, post, hospital, and prison records that are not of enough general historical interest to warrant their microfilm publication. About half the remaining records can also be eliminated from consideration as consisting of files too routine or specialized in nature to be of much general interest.

The remaining 4,250 cubic feet of records consist of the telegrams, correspondence, orders, reports, returns, registers, and other significant records created in the broad conduct of military and naval operations and in the course of general military and naval administration. We estimate that these records could be arranged, edited, and microfilmed for publication at a total cost of about \$425,000.

There are, in addition, significant bodies of official Civil War records in the Library of Congress and elsewhere that should be microfilmed along with the records from which they have been separated. Thus the Library of Congress has the files of the Confederate State Department, which are important for any study of naval history during the war, while the surviving records of the Confederate Executive Office are in the Confederate Memorial Hall in New Orleans. To include all such significant bodies of separated official records would bring the total cost of microfilming up to at least \$500,000.

Obviously we cannot accomplish in the next few years, as part of our regular program, any such sizable enterprise as this. Only about 250 cubic feet out of the 4,250 cubic feet of records mentioned earlier could be covered by our regular program. If, however, the military and naval records were to be microfilmed on the scale you have in mind, the contribution we can make through our regular program had best be diverted, for the sake of proper balance, to microfilming records of other departments than the War and Navy Departments. Such other records are of interest for the diplomatic, political, economic, and social history of the war.

We are, of course, in full sympathy with your Commission's desire to have the microfilming program outlined above done within the next few years. But as such an undertaking is far beyond our capabilities with our normal appropriation and as it is a matter that lies within the coordinative province of your Commission, we should hesitate to assume the initiative by requesting additional funds to cover its cost without specific authorizing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. BAHMER,
Deputy Archivist of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, an extensive selection of official records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Navies, War and Navy Departments was published by the Government in the years 1881-1922. That selection met the needs of surviving participants in the war for an account of the operations in which they had taken part. Students of the history of the Civil War agree that this is quite inadequate for any detailed or scholarly study of events. It includes only a small portion of the telegrams, correspondence, orders, returns, registers, casualty lists, maps, and other records essential to a thorough understanding of developments in any area or specialized service. Moreover, the records that comprise that earlier selection were not reproduced in their original arrangement, so that the conduct of operations and transaction of

business at particular headquarters cannot be followed with any effectiveness.

If students of the Civil War all over the country are to have any adequate opportunity to study the military and naval events of the Civil War in connection with observances during the coming centennial years, the military and naval records will have to be made available in microfilm form. Microfilming is the best way to make them available to users all over the country. Once a negative microfilm has been made at public expense, any student, library, State, city or county historical society, or other user may purchase a positive microfilm copy at a fraction of the cost of making the negative copy. In this way, people who want to study the records will not have to come to Washington to do so, at great cost in time and money. Instead, the records can be brought directly to the people—to scholars and libraries throughout the country. This would not only save thousands of dollars but would encourage many more studies in this very important field of history.

That is the very purpose of the bill I have introduced. The principal object is to facilitate the study of the Civil War, to encourage that study, and to aid those who undertake it.

Archives may be "musty old records" to those who never read them, but to the students who by research and writing try to preserve and restore to life our rich traditions and heritage, and to the reading public such students serve, archives are a principal resource for making the past live again. They not only illuminate the past, they give it vitality. They enable us, the living, to draw upon that past, and to see it in true perspective. And they enable us better to know ourselves as a people, better to understand those subtle and intangible elements that form the seamless web of our common national heritage.

As a means of showing the relation between records, men, and history, I would like to quote the following from Reminiscences of the Honorable Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, by his confidential secretary during the war, Albert E. H. Johnson. The article from which this passage is taken is to be found in the Records of Columbia Historical Society, volume 13, pages 69-97.

When Mr. Stanton became Secretary, the Army was in winter quarters and no fighting in sight or proposed; the city was alive with officers having a good time; and one of the first acts of Mr. Stanton's tyranny was to order these officers to their regiments, where they could learn something of war.

His next act was creating the central telegraph office in rooms adjoining his own, and directing that all war telegrams should go through this office, and copies be furnished him. The originals sent and received by the President, the Secretary, and various officers I kept in separate volumes, making hundreds of volumes of 500 pages each. These books are now kept as sacred records in the War Department and tell the history of the mighty rebellion, a great undertaking never before done in the history of war.

It was Mr. Stanton's design to preserve a complete telegraphic record of the war, and in this work he proved himself first among all the men who ever held a like position at any time, in any country. Carbon copies on yellow tissue paper were handed Mr. Stanton

direct from the telegraph office, and these copies I kept in spring clips such as were then used as clothesline pins, and marked them for each day in the week and Sunday. They were kept on his desk, and at the end of each week I took them from the clips, to be replaced by others.

This way of keeping the record of all telegrams was for Mr. Stanton's own information, but he also ordered that the originals of all telegrams sent from commanding generals, or from any officer with the armies or in the field, be sent to the War Department by the telegraphers who wired them. To this General Grant later objected and Mr. Stanton then made an order that the original of any telegram which should be withheld by the writer should not be paid for by the Government until the original as a voucher was filed in the War Department.

Soon after he became Secretary, one morning, on his way from his home on K Street between 13th and 14th Streets, to the War Department, Mr. Stanton stopped to see General McClellan, then commanding all the armies, and whose headquarters were at the corner of the Belasco Theater Square, where McClellan kept him waiting for an audience, and the Secretary said: "That will be the last time General McClellan will give either myself or the President the waiting snub." In a few days Mr. Stanton ordered the telegraph to be removed from McClellan's headquarters to the War Department, at the same time detaching from his staff his chief operator, then Captain Eckert, who afterward became president of the Western Union Telegraph Co. In doing this McClellan complained that Stanton had taken his dispatches, which was not true, but he left the imprint of his coming power.

When Mr. Stanton centered the telegraph office in the War Department it was to control the military news and have it censored, and to prevent it from reaching the enemy, or the press; and he became the only reliable reporter the press had. So perfect was the system that he could talk to the commanders of all the armies throughout the entire battlefield from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, and in this particular the telegraph office became very attractive to President Lincoln where he could be comfortable, undisturbed and read the telegrams as they were received. In this way the President could pass from the telegraph office into Mr. Stanton's room and answer any telegram he wished to consult him about and on many occasions Mr. Stanton inspired the answers made by the President.

The safety of this telegraphic record was of great concern to Mr. Stanton and in his conflict with President Johnson for possession of the War Department, Mr. Stanton directed me to get a wagon after office hours and have the boxes in which I kept the volumes under lock, taken to the theater in which President Lincoln was assassinated and then occupied by the Surgeon General, and store them in the vault and keep the key. Mr. Stanton had then resigned and with his permission, I turned the key over to the Adjutant General with the information of the place of keeping of the telegrams.

The records thus referred to by Stanton's confidential secretary are now in the National Archives and would be among the first to be microfilmed if the bill I have introduced becomes law.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD concerning a bill I am introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, for appropriate reference, I am submitting a bill that would amend the act of July 14, 1952, entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes," to increase the amount that may be paid to the owner or tenant of land acquired by a military department for a public works project.

This is the title of the bill which answers the question, should the Government pay more for the land it takes? I have felt, as a result of my experiences with land acquisition by the armed services and the Corps of Army Engineers, that too often landowners and property owners were dispossessed of their land or property and were unable to relocate without loss to themselves.

The procedure followed usually has been for the branch of the Federal Government acquiring the land to send their own appraisers to determine the value of the property for which they wish to acquire fee title.

The present law makes it possible for the land or property owner to be paid not to exceed 10 percent or, in certain instances, 25 percent above the appraised value. In many instances, that has not been a sufficient sum to pay the landowners or property owners for the cost of replacement, the Federal and State income tax, attorney fees, court costs, and other costs that are attached to the transfer of property.

It is for this reason that the bill which I am introducing would make it possible to pay up to 50 percent over the appraised value in cases where it would be justified and necessary in order to avoid a hardship on the dispossessed landowner or property owner. The several instances that have come to my personal attention and to the attention of most of the Members of Congress, concerned land acquisition made necessary by flood control measures, expansion of military installations, and the enlargement of facilities manufacturing products for the Defense Department.

I feel that this is a measure that should be given early consideration in the next Congress, and if possible in the present Congress, in order to protect those who are giving up their property in order that many others may benefit.

DEMOCRACY IN LABOR UNIONS

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, increasing concern and attention have rightly been directed by State and National lawmakers to the internal affairs of our labor unions. Revealed needs are to secure for union members greater protection

against the possibility of arbitrary actions by their leaders, and to afford democratic practices and procedures in the conduct of union elections, in the management of union affairs, and in handling union finances. I share this concern, yielding to no one in the intensity of my desire to protect and encourage the exercise of democratic rights, whether in politics or labor unions.

A basic problem, however, is how to accommodate society's interest in democratic union structure with the vital needs for stable and secure unionism and responsible free private collective bargaining.

On Thursday, July 17, I introduced a proposed joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 657—to establish a bipartisan Joint Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations consisting of 8 members, 4 from the House and 4 from the Senate. The membership of the proposed joint committee would be divided equally among Democrats and Republicans. The purpose of the proposed committee would be to diminish politics in the field of labor legislation. Under the joint resolution no proposal could emanate from the committee unless adopted unanimously. By developing a tradition of unanimity alongside a preoccupation with professional approaches in the delicate field of union-management relations, the joint committee could make significant contributions to the cause of a sound American labor policy.

In my statement which accompanied the proposed joint resolution, I affirmed that bipartisanship and unanimity are not always suited for effectuating the proper role of Government in worker-employer relations and labor standards. The proposed joint resolution does not affect the standing labor committees in the House and Senate. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor I shall continue my efforts to advance liberal and progressive causes to improve the workingman's situation, but I expressed the hope that the proposed joint committee would be a valuable addition to the efforts of the Congress to fortify our strongly held democratic beliefs by giving them sturdy underpinnings in the economic structure.

The subject of democracy in labor unions would be ideally suited for the proposed joint committee's consideration, for it could go at the tasks of protecting the union member's rights and the public welfare with a minimum of disturbance which naturally accompanies politically surcharged points of view.

Our traditions dictate that unions should function in a democratic manner. Fairminded persons will admit that most unions do. Moreover, the merged AFL-CIO federation has recently adopted detailed codes of ethical practices dealing, among other things, with union democratic practices.

It is contended, however, that this is not enough—that statutory guarantees and legal sanctions are necessary to insure greater democracy in trade unions, that there are sufficient instances of wrongful and undemocratic actions to

justify and indeed to require protection by law for the individual worker who raises his voice or engages in efforts to protect or dislodge the leadership of the union to which he belongs.

Our Committee on Union-Management Relations, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, has given extensive consideration to proposals for regulatory labor legislation, including suggestions for giving statutory definitions to the essential requirements of democracy in the internal affairs of labor unions. As a member of this subcommittee I have naturally participated in its deliberations on this subject. We have been assisted in our thinking by an excellent study on internal union democracy prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, written by Sar A. Levitan with the assistance of Mary R. Heslet.

My main purpose in addressing the House at this time is to relate to the field of union-management relations a basic distinction between voluntary institutions and legal compulsion which all of us understand. My hope is that whatever legislation is contemplated will be proportioned to a careful and deliberate appraisal of its effects upon industrial peace and our system of essentially free union-management relations.

It is as difficult, or as near to impossible, to impose democracy by law as it is to command free collective bargaining by legal mandate.

When democratic concepts are voluntarily worked out by individuals, their codifications, if evidencing an understanding of the realities of free institutions, have meaning and vigor which afford strong guarantees against those who would trample upon them. This is how our United States Constitution evolved. Our American system of political democracy has traditions based on experience. It is buttressed by deeply held convictions which slowly developed from philosophies—particularly the theory of natural rights—and were underscored by heroic sacrifices and revolutions.

I have often felt, however, that in our international relations we make a mistake particularly in connection with lands emancipated from colonialism in blandly assuming that democratic conceptions of free private union-management relations will thrive simply by telling them to do so. The requirements of organization, the need for experience and the importance of education are too often brushed aside because of vague views about expediency in international relations. Left alone, too many of these newly independent countries fall prey to Communist machinations.

I return to the subject of trade union democracy in the United States in 1958. As legislators we undoubtedly have a legitimate interest in the internal affairs of labor unions. The labor union's unique status as exclusive bargaining representative was given by statute. By statute also we fortified the right of a labor union to require membership as a condition of employment. Statutory encouragements helped to in-

crease union membership. The traditional common law view of the labor union as a private voluntary association or fraternal club will no longer do.

In discharging our Congressional stewardship, however, we have a responsibility for learning the facts. Single-mindedness may be harmful. Collective bargaining is itself a form of industrial democracy, for it increases the workingman's voice and participation in determining his working conditions. The Congress, in its deliberations on pending legislative proposals for protecting trade union democracy, should obtain factual information and weigh the policies which ought to be followed on at least the following subjects:

First, the adequacy and effects of present Federal laws. The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits discriminatory union admission practices, excessive initiation fees, and the levying of union fines or assessments as a condition of employment. The act also materially limits the diversion of union funds for political expenditures, and requires the filing of financial reports by unions which seek recourse to the National Labor Relations Board. These are substantial constraints, though they do not extend very far into the member's relation to the union.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration, the problem of union membership was carefully studied, and it was concluded—largely at the suggestion of the late Senator Taft—that intervening in the internal affairs of labor unions was cumbersome and impractical. Instead it was decided to authorize the union shop only, outlawing the closed shop, which required preexisting union membership as a condition of hiring, and to allow required union membership arrangement—for example, the union shop or maintenance of membership—only for enforcement of reasonable initiation fees and periodic dues.

The Taft view has recently been a basis for arguing that all arrangements for required union membership should be outlawed; that this would obviate the necessity for being concerned over internal union democracy. The fact that this contention has more than casual support should underscore the importance to union leaders of democratizing their internal structures. But union membership may have important values and consequences even where the so-called "right to work" laws are effective, and these laws have their own substantial defects in undermining the prospects of responsible collective bargaining and industrial peace.

Second, present State laws on the subject. More than half of the States have passed laws of one kind or another regulating the internal affairs of unions, though some of these laws are of doubtful validity because of Federal Supreme Court views on Federal preemption. Among these State laws are statutes which compel registration and reporting by unions; prohibit political expenditures; require licensing of union officials; command financial reporting; prohibit admission policies which discriminate against persons on account of race,

creed, or color; require financial accounting, and impose limitations on assessing members; regulate union elections. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the actions of the States have reflected any systematic forward look in this large area. The failure of many of the States to come around to the view that unincorporated labor unions are legal entities is incomprehensible. But there is room for greater cooperation between the States and the Federal Government; federalization can be overdone.

Third, the extent to which the centralization of power in national labor unions—big unionism—is compelled by bigness in business.

Fourth, the differences in the size of local and national unions, the geographical distribution of union members, the extent to which the complicated relation of the local union to the national union is compelled by the characteristics of the industry in which the union is engaged in collective bargaining, or by the requirements of multiemployer bargaining. Highly diversified practices govern the relation of the more than 17 million union members who are federated into about 200 national labor unions. Not all unions are limited to defined industrial lines; there are more catchall unions than many would suppose, and sharp industrial changes caused by mergers, newly discovered plastics and other factors constantly enlarge or contract the industrial lines of union jurisdiction. All these have impact on the union's internal structure and practices.

Fifth, the realities of the collective bargaining process, both from the viewpoint of management and unions. Unions by their nature are frequently on the firing line, are often in need of an internal regime akin to martial law, and required unified action. Management has a right to expect stable and responsible action by a contracting labor union. The concomitance of these factors makes it extremely difficult to limit or specify by statute proper grounds for imposing discipline upon union members.

Sixth, the indifference of union members in matters of attending union meetings and asserting rights which they already have under union constitutions. No amount of legislative protection will help the interests of democracy for those who regard their unions solely as forms of insurance or as service organizations, who limit their attendance to union meetings only for the purposes of augmenting the volume of approval for higher demands upon management.

Seventh, the extent to which the American people desire to have internal procedures of labor unions regulated, and under the guise of regulation often controlled, by government hierarchy, including the danger that this regulation or control may be politically motivated.

Many specific areas of internal union practices need attention to improve democratic procedures. My prejudice in favor of voluntary actions in this field lead me tentatively to the belief that educating the union member to a posture of alertness and awaiting the results of the recently announced AFL-CIO codes of ethical practices ought for the present

be given a chance before legislation, if found to be needed, is embarked upon. Granted that wholly inflexible grounds for imposing discipline are difficult to state, what can we think of a union constitution which provides that a member can be brought to trial for "such other acts or conduct which shall be considered inconsistent with the duties, obligations, and fealty of a member of a union, or violation of sound trade-union principles." And the revealed use of the receivership or trustee device for internal political purposes to stifle local union autonomy is indefensible. Nor would anybody want to defend union disciplinary procedures by which it is possible for assailed autocratic leadership to act as accusers as well as judges. The fact that the upholsterers and the auto workers have established independent public review boards in disciplinary proceedings evidences recognition of the need for improving upon the past.

But improving upon the past is quite a different thing from placing union procedures in a doctrinaire straitjacket which cannot be altered to meet the exigencies of collective bargaining. Democracy without organization has brought about the fall of governments. It can make a shambles of responsibility in the field of collective bargaining, particularly in instances where a union leader is required to temper overzealous unionists whose demands he recognizes as unreasonable, or is obliged to concur in management's disciplinary action against a member, or is placed in the position of attempting to reconcile craft and industrial interests in the same bargaining unit. It is my hope that our deliberations in the field of trade-union democracy, as in regulatory labor legislation generally, will yield solutions which leave our system of collective bargaining in a healthy state.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF AUGUST 4

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for the rest of the day and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further program for this afternoon.

The program for Monday is as follows: The Consent Calendar will be called. There are 20 bills under suspension, as follows:

S. 4071, agriculture, provide more effective marketing programs.

S. 4208, authorization, appropriation for Aeronautics and Space Administration.

S. 3880, create Federal Aviation Agency.

S. 166, veterans, education and training benefits.

S. 1698, veterans, filing claims, veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, mustering-out payments.

H. R. 13559, veterans, war orphans, special training.

H. R. 13371, vessels, payments to revolving fund.

S. 1798, Alaska, vessels, inspection requirements.

H. R. 13153, vessels, ship-mortgage insurance—floating drydocks.

H. R. 8382, vessels, freight forwarders, foreign licensing.

H. R. 474, repeal section 217, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

S. 2255, Merchant Marine Act, authorize investment of funds.

H. R. 8129, providing greater construction, private financing of vessels.

S. 1728, Maritime Academy Act of 1957.

H. R. 7866, amend title 28, United States Code, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

H. R. 13552, provides for the design of the flag of the United States.

H. R. 11056, agriculture, quality regulation of imports.

S. J. Res. 106, investigate radio and television frequencies.

S. 375, Interstate Commerce Act, filing of documents, motor vehicles.

H. R. 12876, extend title 7 of Public Health Act.

A number of those bills are very important pieces of legislation.

Mr. MARTIN. An inquiry was made if that is all the gentleman expects to call Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very pertinent inquiry.

I have talked with my friend from Massachusetts about this. I was going to ask unanimous consent that if these bills are not completed under suspension on Monday it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members for that purpose on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN. I would have no objection to that, because I think the quicker we get the work done the sooner we can all go home. I understand that will include any additional suspensions that may come up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

I submit that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Tuesday, if a rule is reported out on the bill to increase the public debt limit, that will come up then.

Then the bill H. R. 10045, to reconvey lands acquired for the Burke Airport. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] had a colloquy with me last week about that. As a member of the Committee on Rules he requested that the bill be programmed and I told him I would, so I am programming it for Tuesday.

Any rollcall votes other than on rules on Monday or Tuesday will go over until Wednesday, because there are 4 or 5 primaries on Tuesday.

As to the remainder of the week, on Wednesday there will be the bill H. R. 13507, the Welfare and Pension Plans

Disclosure Act. The program for the rest of the week is dependent upon rules, and if rules are reported out I will announce the program to the House just as soon as I can. The bills I have in mind are: H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act; S. 4035, the renewal of housing and urban communities bill; S. 3683, the distressed areas redevelopment bill; and the renegotiation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, can he tell us what he has in mind for the bill H. R. 9521, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which a rule has been granted?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill is very controversial. I feel I should bring up the important legislation on which action must be taken.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This legislation is rather important.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a question of fact. This is coming up at the tail end of the session. The gentleman appreciates that fact. I would rather give the right-of-way to "must" legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is the gentleman's intention to bring this bill up before the close of the session?

Mr. McCORMACK. Intention and ability are two different things.

AMENDMENT OF ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, Friday, August 1, to file a conference report and statement of the managers on the part of the House on H. R. 6006, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tomorrow in which to file reports on S. 3880, S. 375, and Senate Joint Resolution 106.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

IRENE MONTOTOYA

Mr. LANE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill S. 493, for the relief of Irene Montotoya.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on certain bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in support of this measure now before us and to outline to those opposed the urgent necessity for undelayed action in making the Community Facilities Act an actuality.

We are not over the hill yet in this depressed period through which we have been going for the last several months—not by any stretch of the imagination. The labor force in my small State of Rhode Island is suffering from acute and substantial labor surplus. According to the Department of Labor, Providence—the State's major production and employment center—and Newport, a smaller area, cannot expect any marked change in the employment picture for the next few months. To these people who constitute the 12 percent unemployed in the city of Providence, and to others throughout the State, as well as in many other areas of the country, this depression is frighteningly real. For some, unemployment compensation has permitted a bare existence. For still others, compensation has ceased.

Gentlemen, I feel that it is incumbent upon this body to protect the general welfare of all its citizens and to take every conceivable avenue which may lead to a stabilized economy. I am sure most of you share this view. We have before us today an excellent opportunity to create employment while at the same time we assist local units of government to construct, repair, and improve public facilities. This is not a proposal to "make" work through unnecessary construction. The projects to be undertaken are either currently needed and overdue, or are predicated upon the increased population which all of the experts agree will most surely occur. The beneficial results of this legislation cannot be overemphasized.

First, the projects included under this bill—streets, highways, libraries, recreational facilities, hospitals, fire protection and police buildings, water and sewage facilities, to mention a few—are of such a nature that communities can begin construction immediately, thereby achieving needed employment within a short space of time.

Secondly, the facilities eligible for construction under this act are of urgent,

immediate, necessity to many of our towns and cities today—regardless of population or geographical location.

Thirdly, the demand for construction materials will generate employment of other workers thus creating an increased demand for consumer and other goods. This is not conjecture; this is a proven economic principle. If there is any question as to the imperative urgency of stimulating economic activity, witness the latest reports on manufacturers' sales and factory orders. While June showed a slight increase over May, they are still 8 percent below June 1957 and backlogs of unfilled orders continue to decline.

The rapid increase in expenditures experienced by our State and local governments has posed serious financial problems. Taxes have been increased substantially since World War II. It would be virtually impossible to increase taxes in an amount sufficient to accommodate the growing needs of most communities. The only other source of capital for these governments is revenue bonds.

Interest rates generally have been steadily increasing. For this reason many communities have been completely stymied in their efforts to secure sufficient capital to carry out major improvements. As I understand it, the interest rate proposed under this bill as reported from the committee, would approximate 2½ percent. There are few communities, including some of our debt-burdened larger metropolitan areas, who have been able to secure revenue at such an economical cost.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that these are all pressing and impelling reasons for the passage of this bill. We must provide employment for the large number of currently unemployed workers, and we must guard against any further increase in the level of unemployment. Most of the unemployed are not interested in welfare or a stipend in payment for idleness—most of them want the opportunity to earn a decent living for their families.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 40 minutes, on August 6.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on Monday, August 4.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, August 6, and 30 minutes on Thursday, August 7, in each instance to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARTLETT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, the following, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. DINGELL.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2519. An act for the relief of Crum McKinnon Building Co., of Billings, Mont.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2719. An act to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 4167. An act to authorize the lease of Papago tribal land to the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2767. An act to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records;

H. R. 8826. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office;

H. R. 9196. An act to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10805. An act for the relief of certain persons who sustained damages by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods;

H. R. 11805. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 12140. An act to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12850. An act to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13138. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, to provide for more effective integration of a fish and wildlife conservation program with Federal water-resource developments, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 495. An act to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; and

S. 3778. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 4, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2191. A letter from the Budget Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting 1 copy each of standard form 143 for the period ending June 30, 1958, for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, pursuant to Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-34, dated July 25, 1957, entitled "Instructions Relating to Apportionments and Reports on Budget Status"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2192. A letter from the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, transmitting the 11th semiannual report on operations for the period July 1 to December 31, 1957, and a supplement entitled "Statistical Review of East-West Trade 1956-57," to the 10th report which dealt with a detailed description on East-West trade developments, 1956-57, pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2193. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Bureau of Accounts covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 648), 84th Congress, and Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-23, dated June 21, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2194. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1956 and 1957, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2195. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1958, of the claims paid by the Central Intelligence Agency, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOLTZMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1438. An act to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1728. An act to provide certain assistance to State and Territorial maritime academies or colleges; without amendment (Rept. No. 2343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 8129. A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee of conference. S. 493. An act for the relief of Irene Montoya; without amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLYNT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8742. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a 2-year statute of limitations on actions involving transportation of property and passengers of the United States Government and to provide that deductions for overcharges by the United States shall be made within 3 years from time of payment; with amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2517. An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes with respect to certain lands granted to States and Territories for public purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2594. An act to transfer certain property and functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7866. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; with amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1869. An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCORMACK: Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. H. R. 13619. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for construction and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H. R. 6006. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2352). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 13580. A bill to increase the public debt limit; without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 13642. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 13643. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1952, entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes," to increase the amount that may be paid to the owner or tenant of land acquired by a military department for a public works project; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 13644. A bill to correct the inequities of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 13645. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons in the case of religious, educational, and charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGLER:

H. R. 13646. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to publish on microfilm the original military and naval records of the Civil War, both Union and Confederate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 13647. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide readjustment benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 667. Resolution to amend House Resolution 152, as amended, 85th Congress, agreed to February 7, 1957; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia introduced a bill (H. R. 13648) for the relief of Sfc. Lyle L. Carpenter, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

720. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Disabled American Veterans, Department of Pennsylvania, urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient money to enable the Veterans Employment Service of the United States Employment Service, and the State employment service affiliated with that agency, to continue to serve our disabled veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

721. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William C. Thompson, San Antonio, Tex., relative to a redress of grievance, and requesting a personal hearing and review before the proper committee concerning the unconstitutional procedures of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Alaska Land and Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a speech was written in connection with the Alaska statehood debate but not delivered which is of such interest and importance in describing the land situation there that I consider it advisable even now, with the statehood bill having become a law, to place the speech in the RECORD. It follows:

Settlement in Alaska is sparse and on the edge of the unused. Into the Territory's raw and differing areas there is an immigration of men and institutions, seeking to use and develop latent resources. Development is the keynote in the Territory. Its growth prospects instill the hope of great reward and spur great efforts by its people.

There is economic motivation but there is also the driving energy of Alaskans as evident in their homesteading in the wilderness, their building in the cities, and the establishing of new industries in many places. This vitality and hopefulness together with action now to promote its economic growth would assure the extension of the economic heritage of an expanding America.

Growth aspiration and economic opportunity go together. Each is a means to the other. Traditionally, in America, economic prospects have been brightest on the frontier. About the pioneer fringe of an earlier America it has been said "the most significant thing is that it lies at the hither edge of free land." Alaska is in about that position today.

The Territory of Alaska is of tremendous size. It is about one-fifth the size of the United States or about twice the size of the State of Texas. It contains 586,400 square miles of which 571,065 square miles or approximately 365 million acres is land. Of this about 270 million acres is federally owned land or public domain land. Particularly this has come to be regarded as free land though of course this is not literally true.

All of the public domain is not usable land. Of the vast total, only about 2,870,000 acres are subject to cultivation. An estimated 125 million acres is forest land. Estimates of range land vary from about 5 million acres for nearly year-long grazing lands to a total of about 20 million acres for both seasonal and nearly year-long grazing lands. Approximately 120 million acres have been classed by the United States Geological Survey as geologically favorable for oil and gas development. The roughly estimated and inferred coal reserves involve a large acreage containing a total of more than 100 million tons. Prime recreation lands are spread over large areas of Alaska and for the most part are not intensively used. Settlement lands for homesite, business-site, and townsite purposes is largely an adaptation of varying forms of raw land of which only a relatively minuscule amount has been subjected to use.

The lease and disposal of the public domain includes the granting of use and disposal of unreserved Federal lands under a great variety of public-land laws for homestead, homesite, trade and manufacturing,

headquarters, industrial and commercial, grazing, small tract, recreation, institutional, townsite, rights-of-way, and other purposes. Provision of lands for these and other purposes ordinarily is a response to applications for the use of or title to land by private individuals or companies, public or semi-public organizations or institutions, or Federal, Territorial, or municipal Government agencies. Effective action on the applications nearly always involves an examination of the land and the qualifications of the applicant, and under certain of the land laws a classification of the land for specific forms of use and development.

The lease and disposal of mineral resources include the letting of deposits of oil and gas and coal under the mineral leasing laws and the patenting of metalliferous and nonmetalliferous mineral lands under the mining laws. The lease or patenting of mineral lands is in response to applications filed by private individuals or companies. Effective action on lease applications frequently involves an examination of the land and the qualifications of the applicant while those on patent applications nearly always involves a determination of the validity of the mining claims.

Free land, or what is more correct, land at nominal cost, is commonly regarded as the certain fillip for further development. In reality this popular concept is partly true, especially if there are reasonably operative land and mineral laws under which use or title to idle resources can be obtained. Also if there is intelligent, prompt, and equitable administration of the public domain under such land and mineral laws. That these are generally being obtained in Alaska, after long years of neglect, is recognized but much more needs to be done.

The present complex system of public land laws is clumsy and difficult to apply. This is understandable since many are simply extensions of laws designed to fit conditions in the States. To the extent that they are ill-adapted or inflexible, they tend to hamper development.

In general, an enterprise, whether it be private for home, business, or recreational purposes, or public for institutional, community, or Territorial purposes, must be shaped to conform with a specific land law. On the other hand, the Alaska Lands Act, recently adopted by the Territory, is simple and flexible to apply. Under it the land provisions can be tailored to fit the needs of a particular enterprise. This legislation would supplant the multitude of Federal laws and regulations governing land use and disposal in the Territory when Alaska received its own land patrimony.

Settlement in Alaska has been impeded by some of the laws of American pioneer days. Homesteading is an example of this. Homesteading was the vanguard of permanent settlement and development in central North America. It usually came after the more migratory occupation of fur traders, cattlemen, and miners. Over a million good farms in the breadbasket of America began as homestead entries or locations on the public domain. Homesteading became a part of the American folkway to be followed by more intensive farming by the equipped farmers and in places with special economic-geographic advantages by industrialization and urbanization of our modern economy.

In Alaska it was generally expected that settlement and development would proceed in a similar manner. First agricultural occupancy came through homesteading. Parts of Alaska especially the middle Tanana Val-

ley and the upper Look Inlet areas have witnessed considerable homestead settlement, but wherever it has occurred most of it has been temporary with little land development. The Homestead Act alone without a complement of those special aids to agricultural settlement needed in Alaska has not been a successful vehicle for rural occupation and development.

Many of those most concerned with land settlement in Alaska advocated various alternative forms of agricultural settlement more suitable for Alaskan circumstances but it is in the nature of folkways to outlive the conditions which created them and ordinary homesteading continues to this day. With statehood it would be possible to put land and people and money together in aid of agricultural settlement under a system which would work. Alaska needs the produce of 30,000 to 40,000 additional acres of farmland.

Beyond the provision of effective land and mineral laws and efficient public land administration, however, there is a further and complementary need. There is a requirement which is basic to Alaska's settlement and development through successful application of good public land laws and administration. It is the adequate provision of what is called the economic-social "infrastructure" on which the apparatus of production from land and mineral resources can be based. That is the set of basic facilities needed for production such as a minimum of roads, power stations, schools, harbors, hospitals, housing, and Government buildings. Much has been done by the Federal Government to meet some of these needs but a large backlog of public works remain to bring Alaska to an adequate level for development. With local control over resources as well as the provision for public services of all kinds there can be the full measure of coordination required to bring development in a northern environment. Development of basic facilities can be assured at the proper place and at the proper time to foster economic growth at least cost.

Experience over a long period has shown that it is only when effective land and mineral laws, efficient public land administration, and a basic economic-social infrastructure are provided that orderly, economical, and permanent settlement and development occur on America's northern public lands in which private initiative plays its full part, and then only if all are carefully knit into a suitable pattern of area development. The Alaska Lands Act has an area development concept underlying its provisions while the Federal land law system has an individual tract concept as basic to its provisions. The 40 acres and a mule approach to land development in a land like Alaska simply has not worked.

Settlement by the modern pioneer has tended to be in cities in Alaska just as elsewhere in the more northern lands. In 1950, a total of 96,833 people or 75 percent of the Territory's population lived in the greater area or recording districts of the 12 largest cities and towns, and the relative importance of the larger cities is increasing.

The fact that Alaska is predominantly occupied by city and town dwellers was not really recognized until a few years ago when the Alaska Public Works Act was adopted by the Congress. Alaska's needs, present and future, include more community facilities and services and housing to accommodate the white-collar and blue-collar pioneers on the last frontier. Our Federal Government has not fully recognized this fact of life in Alaska. The Federal

townsite laws for Alaska are still piecemeal, complicated, and archaic.

The provisional constitution for the State of Alaska adopted at a constitutional convention at College, Alaska, on February 3, 1951, recognized the importance of urbanism on the Alaskan frontier. It provides for a simple and flexible system of local government adapted to the needs of the people of Alaska. It establishes just two classes of local governments, boroughs, and cities with cooperation between them encouraged by provisions for intergovernmental agreements and the representation of members of city councils in borough assemblies. The constitution recognizes, in short, that urban centers are the foci of the scattered settlement of the northlands—that they are the interchanges for goods and ideas that connect region with region and mold the way of life in Alaska.

I am concerned, as I know you all are, about the development of Alaska for the sake of Alaska. It is developing under Federal custody, to be sure, but not fast enough. I am convinced that if Alaskans were the masters of their own house, it would be developed more rapidly and effectively. I have tried briefly to demonstrate why I think so. An environment that affords incentives to growth can be more readily molded on home grounds by a State government than in the faraway Halls of Congress. National policies and programs, legislation and regulations, administrative plans, and action to promote growth, have tended to be too little, too late, and too cumbersome.

Perhaps, if I were considering the interests of Alaska alone, I would be concerned but not really anxious that Alaska obtain statehood. In view of the obvious need for America to continue to grow to fulfill its obligations at home and to meet its responsibilities abroad, however, I am more than anxious that it do so. I fear, that unless it obtains statehood so that it can fully contribute to the growth of America, we are not being prudent about our Nation's destiny.

As long as America had a frontier being developed it was able to expand its productive capacity at the rate of 4 percent annually. With the closing of the frontier our economy slumped but it became revitalized by the demands placed upon it by World War II and the Korean war. The building of our northern frontier in Alaska, under peace and the more favorable growth conditions statehood would provide, may well be the potent revitalizing force our economy needs. It would, I am sure, help the Nation toward the 5 percent annual growth we need.

Development of the public lands of the United States has produced an economy of relative abundance, a people of comparative plenty. It seems but prudent to continue along the same economic path. Statehood for Alaska is but another milestone in this path. Economically, it seems, the Nation needs to turn the milestone now.

The need of the United States for development of Alaska to meet the material requirements of Americans and their technological economy by 1975 is abundantly clear. Take account of the supply of natural resources in the United States and the prodigious demands to be placed upon them by an expanding economy for a rapidly increasing population. Economists believe that by 1975 our consumption will exceed production by 20 percent. Conservationists believe that many lower grade resources will need to be brought into use by 1975 through development of new technologies and improved extraction processes. The resources of Alaska, oil, gas, coal, timber, forage, soils, minerals, and water-power, the bone and sinew of our economy, have a certain place in this picture. They need to be drawn into use to be sure we have a stronger America each year.

The balancing of resource supply with consumption is a challenge to innovation, to inventiveness, and to statesmanship. Statehood now will help. The America of tomorrow needs Alaska statehood today.

Assuming it is our purpose to one day grant statehood, and, as you all know by now, we are committed to do this, it is in the national interest to do so now. Many of the latent resources of Alaska will be in national demand and in demand by the Free World a few years hence. I have tried to show that Alaska as a State can better provide the incentives for development than a National Government far away. Industry is now actively engaged in appraising Alaskan resources, some with thought of immediate investment in development, but some with the future in mind. Business, large scale, the kind that can develop the resources of the giant of Alaska, is in need of lead time for planning development. It needs that, but also it must know the rules of the game. Effective planning now requires knowing whether development will be under Alaskan rules or national rules. For sake of development for a stronger America, the stage needs to be set now by granting statehood so private enterprise can confidently press forward plans for resources development. Statehood now amounts to national prudence.

Lastly, I, as you, have been alarmed by the economic progress of the Soviet Union. It is forcing development everywhere with which to support worldwide economic warfare. In the Soviet Union astonishing development is occurring in its northern lands. Development there is certainly strengthening its economy and its military posture. There is no question we are not doing as well. There can be no doubt we need to do more than now to develop the resources of our northland for use in aid of defense and economic development of the Free World. A State government and a National Government working together is the best combination I know of for the task.

In summary, Alaska's growth is needed for Alaska's sake. It is needed in aid of national growth. It is needed in aid of the Free World. Accelerated development that would be encouraged with statehood is common national prudence. Statehood now, it seems to me, would serve a national purpose.

The Gentleman Is Mistaken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD yesterday I found an insertion, of which I had had no notice, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] who criticizes me and Romulo Betancourt, the leader of the Democratic Action Party in Venezuela.

The gentleman is confused. He says he telephoned me when the Alaskan statehood bill was before the House because he saw I had arranged for an hour of time. He says that I told him I was not going to speak on Latin American affairs but that then I went ahead and did just that. The gentleman is mistaken. He never telephoned me then or at any other time.

If the gentleman's feeling, based on an erroneous recollection, is that I avoided

debating him on Latin American policy, I am at his service at any time convenient to him. He has seen fit to defend Trujillo Senior and Trujillo Junior on the floor of the House, a matter I am prepared to debate with the gentleman on the floor or elsewhere.

The gentleman states that he is not surprised that my remarks against communism in Venezuela were not printed in the press there and adds, "if they were said." If the gentleman had undertaken to inform himself in any measure, he would have learned that I made many statements about the Communist menace when I was in Venezuela and that, ultimately, these statements were with a few exceptions published widely in that country.

The gentleman states that he declined to be briefed by the State Department. My respectful suggestion is that he reconsider that decision.

As for his remarks against Romulo Betancourt, I cannot take them seriously because it is evident that the gentleman again is both uninformed and misinformed.

A Sense of Congress Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the President of the United States is expected to attend a summit meeting with Nikita Khrushchev and other world leaders. At that time one of the principal subjects of discussion will be the Middle East and the very real threat of war in that area.

Certainly the question of Israel's continued existence will be raised.

A first premise of American policy must be that there will be no sell-out of Israel. Israel's right to continue to exist as a free independent sovereign nation with her territorial integrity preserved must be a basic American policy. There must be no compromise on Israel's continued free existence.

Ten years ago the restoration of Israel was supported by the United States and other Free World countries. America was among the first to recognize this new sister democracy. This nation, which has given haven and sanctuary to more than 900,000 Jews, reclaimed a desert wasteland, and developed a vigorous economy and free democratic institutions, has earned its right to stay forever free.

Certainly the President must press for a program jointly with Russia in guaranteeing the borders and territorial sovereignty of all nations in the area. A similar guaranty should be made through and by the United Nations.

The conference should include discussion of assistance both by the United States and Russia independently, and through the U. N., in the resettlement of the Arab refugees who are causing grave economic and political disturbance dur-

ing their period of meager existence, privation and suffering in Jordan, the Gaza Strip and elsewhere.

The discussion must include a serious effort to achieve a U. N. police force sufficiently strong in number and in authority to prevent border raids, gun running, and military operations of any sort large or small. Economic assistance should be offered to those nations which will assist in restoring peace to the area.

To assist in this I am introducing a "sense of Congress resolution" in the hope that other Members who feel as I do may express their views on this subject. I hope this will manifest the sense of the Congress and the people of the United States that there should be a real U. N. police force to deal with the tension and strife we see in the Mid-East.

Community Facilities Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adopt the rule making the Community Facilities Act of 1958 in order, I was not recorded as voting for or against the rule but with a general pair.

It is my desire to make plain the reason for such action on my part. I am in favor of the general purpose or objective of legislation to assist needy municipalities in obtaining necessary facilities such as water, sewerage, and other public works. In many instances it has been shown that such could not be obtained, particularly by small municipalities, without the payment of an exorbitant rate of interest and, in some cases, the necessary loans to finance such were not procurable at any price. I would gladly vote for such legislation in a reasonable amount and with reasonable limitations. However, the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and, which this rule would bring up for consideration (S. 3497), is so unreasonable in many particulars that I deem it wise to require the committee to give further consideration to the subject and report a more realistic bill.

The best evidence that the bill was not what it should have been can be drawn from the fact that the chairman of the committee addressed the House and announced that he would offer several amendments for the purpose of removing certain objectionable features. Of course, it was plain that this offer upon his part was with the evident intention of trying to get the rule for consideration of the bill adopted. This was a very unusual procedure and there was no certainty that the amendments he would offer would be adopted. If not, then we would still have an unsatisfactory bill.

It seemed to me that the proper course for me to pursue under the circum-

stances, being in favor of legislation on the subject, but not in favor of the particular bill as offered, was to refrain from voting on the committee bill as offered, and await further action by the committee. It is my hope that the committee will recognize not only the necessity for some legislation, but, that it must be reasonable in character as to the type of the facilities and terms upon which loans may be made, and the overall amount to be appropriated. A bill that would meet these requirements would be entitled to more favorable consideration than was accorded the bill presently reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and which the proposed rule would bring before us for consideration.

Hon. John A. Burns of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to present here my estimate of the effectiveness of the work in this Congress of Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, of Hawaii, in connection with statehood. It is my opinion that had JACK BURNS been a man of narrow vision instead of broad statesmanship it is quite possible that Alaska would not have achieved statehood in 1958; and if Alaska had failed it is certain as certain can be, in consideration of all prevailing circumstances, that Hawaii would not have been admitted to the Union alone. If JACK BURNS had insisted upon coupling the two bills a great storm would have been raised but no constructive accomplishment would have been made. That is an absolute fact. But nevertheless that is the course of action which might well have been followed if JACK BURNS had been a less dedicated and devoted servant to his people than he is. He could have perhaps gained some temporary political credits at home if he had moved to link the two statehood bills. In refusing to do so, he not only demonstrated political courage of a rare type which ought to be appreciated by his constituents but he did something more important for them—he brought Hawaii statehood ever so much closer.

Years ago when Hawaii was ahead in this search of the two Territories for political equality by way of statehood I took the position that if one went through the other could not remain far behind. That is as true today as it was true then. I firmly believe now as I believed then that Hawaii is justly entitled to statehood and I dare say that Alaska's delegation in the 86th Congress will be proud to associate themselves with those pressing for early and affirmative action on Hawaii statehood.

In the meantime, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Delegate BURNS. In a speech I made a couple of

weeks ago at Ketchikan I was happy to state a belief that his actions in this Congress not only were important in the attainment of Alaska statehood but brought Hawaii statehood that much nearer. I do not think any other conclusion can be reached after an appraisal and assessment of what JACK BURNS has done. He is entitled to and will, I know, receive as much credit at home for all of this as he has from those in a position to know here in Washington.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I take this opportunity to provide the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois with a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 85th Congress.

Looking back over my first 2 years as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I say unhesitatingly that my greatest concern lies in the fact that the Federal Government here in Washington continues its trend of expansion in many fields of our national life.

I have two basic reasons for this fear: First, it involves new and increased Federal spending at a time when prudence demands that we live within our means; and second, it enhances the process of chipping steadily away at the individual freedoms of our people.

There are those in this great legislative body who prefer to avoid any discussion of the national debt or the increased spending programs which we must inevitably face realistically at some future time—that is, if we are to maintain the internal security of the country.

With this thought in mind at all times, I voted throughout the 85th Congress as conservatively as good fiscal judgment behooves. In a sense of modest pride I point to my voting record during the past 2 years as one of the best in Congress from the standpoint of Government economy. In this connection I should further explain that I cast each vote on the basis of the sound necessity of the legislation involved in its relationship to the broad aspect of our national fiscal situation.

I believe it is important to remind the good people back in my district that every service rendered by the Federal Government costs tax dollars. As a matter of fact, in most instances the tax dollar sent to Washington for spending by the Federal Government shrinks in its spending power because of the excessive administrative costs of bureaucracy. And until each of us realizes that the average citizen must pay, perhaps

dearly, every dollar spent at a national level, we shall continue to be plagued by the disease of unbalanced budgets, tremendous interest costs and eventually higher and higher taxes.

We must remember, too, that casting a vote of approval on all items of legislation which tend to increase the cost of Federal Government is positively a vote to increase the amount of money taken from every worker's paycheck. For years the Federal Government has repeatedly spent more than has been received, notwithstanding the fact that taxes have been higher than any time in our history over this same period.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

To streamline the operation of our national defense program, Congress passed the Defense reorganization bill which promises both efficiency and economy in the most costly of our Government operations. The Defense reorganization bill is a step in the right direction and was long needed to eliminate overlapping of authority and certain rivalries between the various branches of the service.

ALASKA STATEHOOD

After many years of deliberation, the 85th Congress voted statehood for Alaska in one of the most historic actions in recent history. As a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I helped formulate the legislation which granted statehood for the Territory of Alaska.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

H. R. 8002, one of the major Hoover Commission recommendations which grants Congress control over unused appropriations, was passed during this session. This legislation makes it necessary for the various departments of Government to return to the Treasury surplus funds which previously had been carried over from one year to the next.

SOCIAL SECURITY

During the closing weeks of this session, Congress passed legislation amending the original Social Security Act. It increased the benefit payments by 7 percent and liberalized certain dependency benefits. However, and most important, it provided for an increase in employee-employer contributions into the fund which improved the actuarial status of the trust fund of the system.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Congress enacted laws to protect the internal security of the country including the right to maintain the secrecy of the FBI files in subversive cases as well as in curbing certain powers of the Supreme Court to nullify State laws where the Federal law does not have jurisdiction.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The 85th Congress enacted a law requiring a statement of audit in connection with both union and company welfare and pension funds. A majority of the House voted to reject the Kennedy-Ives bill which was basically a weak piece of legislation brought to the floor with only 40 minutes, debate on a closed rule—one that provided no opportunity for any type of amendment or discussion of amendments.

SMALL BUSINESS

Legislation to assist small and independent business of the country, similar in many respects to my bill, H. R. 5652, was enacted. The legislation amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for tax exemptions for expansion and modernization in small business operations and other assistance.

FARM LEGISLATION

Congress adopted a realistic and practical agriculture program in an effort to retain a free farm economy. Efforts to put through legislation for unrealistic increases in farm subsidies were twice defeated in the House.

EDUCATION

The Federal scholarship bill with the outright grant provision removed in favor of student loans was passed by the House and sent to the Senate in the closing week of the session. Unfortunately, legislation to provide tax exemptions to cover expenses of dependents attending institutions of higher learning was not acted upon in this session. Such legislation, I believe, should be given priority handling in the 86th Congress.

There were many other important items of legislation too numerous to mention and too complex to discuss in this résumé which I shall be happy to furnish to my constituency during the adjournment months through both my District and Washington offices. These other items of legislation include veterans' legislation, extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, mutual security, loyalty security programs, railroad relief legislation, and highway and public works bills.

The résumé follows:

LEGISLATION WHICH REPRESENTATIVE COLLIER INTRODUCED DURING THE 85TH CONGRESS

H. R. 2791 (lake diversion bill). A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water into the Illinois Waterway.

H. R. 2413. A bill to create a National Library of Medicine located in Chicago, Ill.

H. R. 5652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business.

H. R. 9643. A bill to defer schoolteachers from military draft except in time of national emergency.

H. J. Res. 516. A House joint resolution seeking to designate the 22d day of April in each year as a National Prayer for Peace Day and declaring one-half of such day to be a legal holiday.

H. R. 7566. A bill to provide tax exemption on certain costs for education of dependents.

H. R. 10900. A bill to provide tax deductions for teachers to defray expenses of furthering their education while teaching.

H. R. 4678 and 5196. Bills to provide tax exemptions on interest paid to holders of series E and H United States bonds at maturity.

H. R. 7565. A bill to provide that one-half of any budget surplus for any fiscal year be applied against the public debt and the balance of such surplus as a tax credit against individual income taxes.

H. R. 12069. A bill to repeal the wartime excise taxes on transportation.

H. R. 12793. A bill to preserve audio recordings in the Library of Congress of historic addresses.

H. R. 11114. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors.

H. J. Res. 518. A House joint resolution calling for the designation of October 31 of each year as National Youth Honor Day.

H. R. 13005. A bill to amend the Passport Act of July 3, 1926, to authorize certain restrictions and limitations with regard to issuing passports to Communists and subversives established as potential dangers to our national security.

H. R. 12577. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications.

H. R. 5321. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children.

A WELL-INFORMED CONSTITUENCY

In my opinion, a well-informed constituency is paramount to an understanding of a Congressman's work and the important functions of government. For this reason I established a policy of publishing a monthly newsletter on Congressional activity as well as my stand on every major legislative issue. More than 200,000 of these were mailed to citizens and taxpayers in my District. Everyone who indicated his or her desire to be placed on my mailing list, received these reports. In addition, my staff sent out news releases regularly and special reports on more complex legislation.

At the beginning of the session, I also conducted a public opinion poll throughout my District in the form of a questionnaire sent to approximately 50,000 homes representing a random cross section of the people. These were tabulated and became part of my consideration in voting on the issues which came before the 85th Congress.

Shortly after my election to Congress, I established a District Congressional office which was open 8 to 10 hours a day to assist the public in problems which arose while Congress was in recess.

Following adjournment of Congress in August of last year, I remained in my District until we reconvened, and delivered 71 speeches of a nonpolitical nature on Congressional activity, appearing before civic and church groups, service organizations, and even high school classes throughout the District.

My staff assisted several hundred residents of the District who visited Washington with their families during the past 2 years. In fact, we dedicated our efforts to being as close to each and every citizen as was humanly possible because we feel the need of bringing the activities of the Federal Government close to those who are affected by the laws which we pass and who must assume the burden of the cost of the vast operation of the Federal Government.

**Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota,
Writes on Hopes for Disarmament**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an article in the August 1958 issue of the

Progressive magazine has served to demonstrate once again the thoughtful leadership in the field of foreign policy exercised by our brilliant colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He serves as chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee.

Senator HUMPHREY's article is entitled "Turning Point for Disarmament." In it he stresses that a nuclear test ban, safeguarded by adequate inspection provisions, could help to liberate the world from the crushing economic and psychological burden of ever-mounting armaments of all kinds.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the able article on our hopes for disarmament by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is our recognized spokesman and advocate in this field, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING POINT FOR DISARMAMENT

(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

When the technical experts of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries convened recently at Geneva to explore the requirements of inspection for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, the event was widely greeted as a turning point in the disarmament problem. The vital significance of their meeting was that the great military powers, after years of futile talk, delay, and obstructionism, were finally getting down to cases and were penetrating to an area of the disarmament problem where there might be meaningful accomplishment.

Lack of political practicality has long bedeviled disarmament negotiations. For a great many years we toiled away at a proposal for controlling nuclear arms—the so-called Baruch or United Nations plan—that, as we look back on it now, was too elaborate and advanced in its aims. It was a comprehensive proposal envisaging international control of fissionable material from mine pit to end product. While in many respects the Baruch proposal was one of the noblest offers ever made by any nation, it was impractical because it misread the acceptability of the proposal to a government that feared contact and interchange of information between its own people and non-Communist countries. Time and technology inevitably took their toll of the Baruch plan, and eventually our scientific inability to detect hidden and rapidly swelling stockpiles of nuclear bombs made it obsolete.

In an effort to adjust to technical and political realities, international discussions then shifted to plans for disarmament by phases or stages. Last year the administration settled on what it euphemistically called a "first step" proposal. But this proposal, containing interlocking provisions for ending nuclear weapons tests and production, for cutting back armed forces and conventional arms and for inspection against surprise attack, was entirely too complicated for a first step. To expect a tightly sealed entity like the Soviet Union to embrace in one gesture a package like that was naive. To continue to cling to the package after its acceptance became utterly hopeless was, and still is, incomprehensibly obtuse.

When the negotiations broke down at London last year, commonsense dictated that the package be broken up and subdivided, particularly since there was no logic in keeping all of the provisions locked together. It was plain to see that an initial step had to be relatively small and simple, if it were going to be politically acceptable as well as tech-

nically feasible. To be of substantial disarmament value it had to check the forward rush of the arms race. All signs pointed to a suspension of nuclear tests as one of the most logical steps. A ban on tests would be relatively uncomplicated scientifically, and it would check the arms competition—which is in large part a technological competition—at a key point, the development of nuclear weapons.

The mounting pressure from world public opinion has created an opportunity for the nuclear powers to demonstrate their will to slow down the arms race. But the Eisenhower administration has dragged its feet. Its stubbornness has cost us dearly in the eyes of the world. It was foolish of the administration to believe that the Kremlin would ever hesitate to seize an opportunity to score a propaganda point. When Moscow announced several months ago a conditional suspension of nuclear tests, I called on our own Government to press for an international agreement to suspend tests with inspection. The administration has not thus far been able to reconcile its own differences of opinion over whether a suspension of tests with inspection should be sought.

Part of the battle revolves around the question whether there can be an effective inspection network to check on a nuclear test moratorium. Dr. Edward Teller, director of the Livermore Radiation Laboratory, maintains that the Soviet military nuclear experts could cheat on a complete test ban. Dr. Hans Bethe, of Cornell University, a leading physicist on Dr. Killian's Scientific Advisory Committee, says they could not get away with sneak testing. A conclusive answer to the question cannot be found if the question is viewed solely in scientific terms.

Much of the controversy over inspection could be allayed if two principles were kept in mind. First, there must be an inspection system which is effective and adequate. We could not permit ourselves to be drawn into an agreement under which we would deprive ourselves of an important weapon in our armory while the other side secretly continued to arm itself with that weapon. Such a situation would not contribute to peace and would only hasten the conflagration we are trying to avoid. Inspection has to be good enough so that every country knows there is a great probability it is going to be caught if it tries to cheat on the agreement.

As long as an inspection system possesses this amount of certainty, we would have a high degree of assurance that no signatory of a suspension pact would run the political risk of sneaking an illegitimate test explosion. The military advantage it might get from a sneak test under such conditions would probably be so limited it would be far outweighed by the political disadvantages of getting "caught in the act" and thus ignominiously causing termination of the agreement, incurring the opprobrium of world public opinion, and, most important, causing the arms race to continue unabated.

What the perfectionists overlook is that there is a risk in whatever course we take. The second principle, therefore, is that there must be a balancing of risks between one course of action and another. This is the way we usually solve the problems of life. In disarmament we must weigh prudently all the dangers of continuation of the nuclear-arms buildup toward an unpredictable climax against the risks that might be involved in a suspension of tests with an inspection network. We must balance the danger of spreading nuclear weapons know-how to fourth, fifth, and innumerable other countries against the danger that the U. S. S. R., which has, according to public reports, made about 50 tests to our approximately 100, might try to sneak a few more.

The joint study group which was conferring at Geneva as this was written can be a major breakthrough on the inspection front. For years the United States has been insisting on adequate nuclear inspection and other forms of disarmament. The Soviet diplomats have stalled, squirmed, evaded, and several times raised our hopes mightily with concessions that appeared to be consequential but eventually turned out to be more smoke than substance. In general they have refused to be pinned down on the inspection issue. In the hope that a non-political approach might get results, I have suggested several times that experts from each side study the general inspection question from a purely technical aspect. Finally, Khrushchev turned his habitual "nyet" into a reluctant "da," and accepted the offer of President Eisenhower to have technical groups study inspection for test suspension.

The administration deserves much credit for going ahead with studies for inspection of a test ban. But it has struck a sour note in refusing to modify its nuclear disarmament policy. The President asserted that the technical studies would be without prejudice to the respective positions of the United States and the Soviet Union "on the timing and interdependence of various aspects of disarmament." In plain English, this meant that the United States did not consider that the technical studies on inspection for a test suspension, if successful, would commit us to negotiate at a political level for an agreement on a test ban separate from the disarmament package. As I was writing this the administration was still feverishly debating with itself whether a test halt should be entered into independently. Yet, how long does the White House think it can deny the logic of events? What if the American and Soviet technical committees agree on what constitutes effective and reliable inspection for a suspension of tests? Is the administration, which insisted on creating the technical committee, still going to clench its teeth in determined refusal to go along? To dispel any misimpression the world might have of United States intentions in participating in the technical study, the President should immediately announce the willingness of this country to agree, separately and distinctly from other disarmament measures, to negotiate at a political level for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests if the technical committee agrees on the inspection requirements.

One question I am often asked is whether I really believe that the secretive U. S. S. R. will ever accept a reliable inspection system. This is going to be a tough mouthful for the Soviet leaders to swallow, but there is genuine evidence that they will come around to it. First, there is a great deal of evidence that they want a lessening of their arms burden. Economic pressures in the Soviet economy—mounting consumer demand, dwindling manpower reserves, and the multiplying complications of an expanding industry—are working to restrict the labor and materiel going into the military effort. Some of our experts on Soviet Russia now believe that top Russian officials are beginning to see more clearly that they cannot have an international agreement to limit armaments without accepting some kind of inspection.

But the proof of the pudding is in the eating. When the technicians' committee reports, we shall then have a sharper picture of how far the Soviet Union is prepared to go. The number of inspection stations will be a key issue. There is a close correlation between the number of inspection stations and the extent to which a test ban can be effectively inspected. The larger the number of stations the smaller the size of a nuclear test explosion that can be reliably identified. But if the number of stations should be radically limited, then the likelihood of confusing earthquakes with underground explosions would increase. The

greater the number of stations, the greater the chance any explosion would be correctly identified.

The really significant thing is to get a test ban in effect and an inspection system in operation. Installation of an inspection system would be a political breakthrough of momentous proportions. It could be a landmark of the greatest historical importance in Free World-Communist relations, a turning point toward peace in our time. Opponents of a nuclear test ban often miss this vital political factor.

The arguments for continuing tests to develop defensive weapons against enemy intercontinental missiles or for small clean tactical weapons to limit the threat of all-out nuclear war may be justified within a purely military frame of reference. But such a frame of reference is much too narrow. A purely military frame of reference will sooner or later eventuate in a purely military result.

Our frame of reference must encompass broader considerations, in particular the acceptance of the fact that differences between the Communist bloc and the demo-

cratic West must be resolved through peaceful competitive coexistence. History teaches that the most antagonistic ideological opponents have an interest in survival, and sooner or later learn to reach a peaceful *modus vivendi*. This is why disarmament is primarily a political rather than a military problem. This is why an inspection breakthrough into the Soviet Union outweighs the military value of the development of new varieties of nuclear weapons.

Those who insist that a cutoff of nuclear weapons production be linked to a nuclear test suspension should be more perceptive of the political realities and view this whole problem of disarmament in more of a time perspective. A temporary inspected test termination would constitute a natural step toward a prohibition of nuclear arms production.

The President has often insisted that a cutoff in the production of nuclear material for weapons purposes is the heart of the nuclear weapons problem. Bulganin and Khrushchev have also asserted that the discontinuance of the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons should be among the aims of disarmament. Since both Govern-

ments have individually proclaimed this as a goal of nuclear disarmament, I propose that this and perhaps other specific disarmament goals be jointly affirmed in principle by both Governments. The best time to do this would be at the time a test ban agreement is concluded for it would then refute any impression that the test ban was the only disarmament we wanted.

Both supporters and opponents of a temporary nuclear test suspension should realize that it would be only a beginning. It is only the first phase of our total disarmament blueprint. As a test ban comes closer to realization, we must stress our purpose of progressing to other phases of arms control; otherwise the momentum we desire as one of the main effects of the ban might be lost. By pressing inexorably onward to bring into operation a nuclear weapons test suspension and the rest of our disarmament blueprint, we shall bring closer the day when we can rid the world of its burdens of fear, hate, and want. The inauguration of a test ban now could start the wheels of international reconciliation turning and initiate a movement that will eventually bring genuine peace to the troubled peoples of the world.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 1958

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Father Almighty, in reverence we stand before Thy greatness that we cannot comprehend, as our little lives are enfolded by a love that is broader than the measure of man's mind.

Yet, we are grateful that our eyes have seen beauty, our hearts have felt love, our minds have discovered truth, and our wills have been gripped by purposes that lift and ennoble and tie us to causes greater than our own brief span.

As this day their colleagues remember the qualities which endeared them to multitudes in the States which trusted and honored them, we thank Thee for the private lives and the public service of MATTHEW M. NEELY and W. KERR SCOTT, workmen who needed not to be ashamed, and who now rest from their labors.

Facing the tasks of a new week, give us a vision of the far-off years as they may be if redeemed by the Sons of God, so that we shall take heart and shall battle more valiantly, as with eager devotion we dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open to all mankind the gates of a new life.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 1, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced

that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 31, 1958:

S. 3076. An act to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases; and

S. 3478. An act to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus.

On August 1, 1958:

S. 1732. An act to readjust equitably the retirement benefits of certain individuals on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes;

S. 1939. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275), as amended;

S. 2447. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides, upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources following application of these materials and to provide basic data on the various chemical controls so that forests, croplands, wetlands, rangelands, and other lands can be sprayed with minimum losses of fish and wildlife;

S. 2617. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended; and

S. 3677. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and

the Committee on the Judiciary may meet during the session of the Senate today. This request has been cleared with the minority leadership.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief announcement for the information of the Senate: At the conclusion of the morning hour, I shall submit a resolution to provide that the Senate proceed with memorials on the lives and characters of the late Senator SCOTT, of North Carolina, and the late Senator NEELY, of West Virginia, and that during that period legislative business be suspended.

I should also like to announce now, to the Senate, that I do not wish to ask Members to remain in the Chamber, for the sessions, for extremely long hours; however the sessions will begin earlier and will continue longer than has been the custom thus far during the session.

I suppose all Members realize that the Congress is now in the last days of the session. I am not willing to say that the session will continue 2 weeks, 3 weeks, or 4 weeks, because I do not think any 1 person has the power, under the rules of the Senate, to control the length of the session. But I wish to say to the Senate and to the country that I believe this body will not end its proceedings until it has finished its work.

Many constructive measures are yet to be acted upon. For instance, one of them is the education bill, the so-called